

GENERALIZED AFFINE SPRINGER FIBERS

ROBERT KOTTWITZ AND EVA VIEHMANN

ABSTRACT. This paper studies two new kinds of affine Springer fibers that are adapted to the root valuation strata of Goresky-Kottwitz-MacPherson. In addition it develops various linear versions of Katz's Hodge-Newton decomposition.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let G be a connected reductive group over $\mathbb{C}$. Let A be a maximal torus in G . We write $\mathfrak{a}$ for the Lie algebra of A , R for its set of roots, and W for its Weyl group.

For $u \in \mathfrak{g} = \text{Lie } G$ the Springer fiber over u is the closed subvariety of the flag manifold of G obtained as the set of Borel subgroups B such that $u \in \text{Lie } B$. For regular $u \in \mathfrak{a}$ the Springer fiber over u is the set of Borel subgroups containing A , on which W acts simply transitively.

Now consider the formal power series ring $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{C}[[\epsilon]]$ and its fraction field $F = \mathbb{C}((\epsilon))$. To keep this introduction more readable, we assume that G is semisimple and simply connected, so that Iwahori subgroups in $G(F)$ are their own normalizers. For $u \in \mathfrak{g}(F)$ the affine Springer fiber [KL88] over u is the closed subset of the affine flag manifold obtained as the set of Iwahori subgroups I such that $u \in \text{Lie } I$.

The affine Springer fiber over u is nonempty when u is *integral* in the sense that it is contained in some Iwahori subalgebra (equivalently, in some parahoric subalgebra). For $u \in \mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O})$ with regular image in $\mathfrak{a}(\mathbb{C})$ the affine Springer fiber over u is the set of Iwahori subgroups containing $A(\mathcal{O})$, on which the affine Weyl group $W \ltimes X_*(A)$ acts simply transitively.

Now suppose only that $u \in \mathfrak{a}(F)$ is regular in $\mathfrak{g}(F)$. As in [GKM] we attach to u the root valuation function $r_u : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ defined by $r_u(\alpha) = \text{val } \alpha(u)$. Then u is integral if and only if every value of r_u is nonnegative (equivalently, if $u \in \mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O})$), and in this case the image of u in $\mathfrak{a}(\mathbb{C})$ is regular if and only if r_u is the constant function 0. The affine Springer fiber over u becomes more and more complicated as the values of r_u increase.

All the results in this paper were motivated by the desire to find a generalized affine Springer theory adapted to a given root valuation function r . More precisely we wanted the generalized affine Springer fibers over points in the stratum

$$\mathfrak{a}(F)_r := \{u \in \mathfrak{a}(F) : r_u = r\}$$

to resemble traditional affine Springer fibers over points in the simplest stratum

$$\mathfrak{a}(F)_0 := \{u \in \mathfrak{a}(F) : r_u = 0\}.$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 11F85; Secondary 20G25, 22E67.

Key words and phrases. Root valuation strata, affine Springer fibers, Hodge-Newton decomposition.

The research of R.K. was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-0245639.

In this paper we give two such generalizations, each of which has its advantages and disadvantages. By way of motivation we first consider the trivial case in which r is constant with value n . We fix an Iwahori subgroup I containing $A(\mathcal{O})$ and consider the generalized affine Springer fiber

$$(1.1) \quad \{g \in G(F)/I : g^{-1}ug \in \epsilon^n \text{Lie } I\}.$$

This is not much of a generalization, since the set (1.1) coincides with the traditional affine Springer fiber over $\epsilon^{-n}u$, but it does the job, because now our generalized affine Springer fibers over points in $\mathfrak{a}(F)_r$ are the same as the traditional ones over $\mathfrak{a}(F)_0$.

When r is not constant, the situation becomes much more interesting, and we consider generalized affine Springer fibers of the form

$$(1.2) \quad Z_{r,\lambda}(u) := \{g \in G(F)/K_{r,\lambda} : g^{-1}ug \in \Lambda_{r,\lambda}\},$$

where $\Lambda_{r,\lambda}$ is what we call a *root valuation lattice* for r , and where $K_{r,\lambda}$ is the connected normalizer of $\Lambda_{r,\lambda}$ in $G(F)$. When r is constant with value n , the lattice $\epsilon^n \text{Lie } I$ is in fact a root valuation lattice for r , and $K_{r,\lambda}$ turns out to be I .

Root valuation lattices are defined in section 11, and in section 12 we prove for them the Conjugation Theorem 12.1. When translated into the language of generalized affine Springer fibers, this theorem states that for $u \in \mathfrak{a}(F)_r$ the set (1.2) can be identified with a certain quotient of $W_r \ltimes X_*(A)$; here W_r is the stabilizer of r in W , and the quotient is taken modulo the subgroup consisting of elements that can be realized in the normalizer of A in $K_{r,\lambda}$.

One disadvantage of root valuation lattices is that $K_{r,\lambda}$ is usually not a parahoric subgroup, but rather just a subgroup of one, so that $G(F)/K_{r,\lambda}$ is usually not ind-proper. However they have the advantage that $\Lambda_{r,\lambda}$ always contains $\{k^{-1}uk : k \in K_{r,\lambda}, u \in \mathfrak{a}(F)_r\}$ as a Zariski dense open subset (see section 11), from which it immediately follows that every element in $\Lambda_{r,\lambda}$ lies in the closure of the root valuation stratum $\mathfrak{g}(F)_r = \{g^{-1}ug : g \in G(F), u \in \mathfrak{a}(F)_r\}$. Thus root valuation lattices give, at least in principle, some information concerning the difficult unsolved problem of describing closures of root valuation strata in $\mathfrak{g}(F)$. From this point of view it is certainly desirable to have $\Lambda_{r,\lambda}$ be as big as possible. Here the size of a lattice is measured by its codimension in some standard lattice containing it.

Our characterization of root valuation lattices in section 11 yields an upper bound on their size. In section 13 we define explicitly for each root valuation function a corresponding root valuation lattice which almost achieves this upper bound. For groups of small rank we were always able to find an ad hoc definition of an optimal root valuation lattice whenever our general construction did not already provide one. This did not lead, however, to a likewise simple general construction of larger root valuation lattices.

Now we turn to our other generalization of affine Springer theory, again beginning with the case in which r is constant with value n . Then (1.1) can also be described as

$$\{g \in G(F)/I : g^{-1}ug \in C_n\},$$

where

$$C_n = \{v \in \mathfrak{g}(F) : \text{ad}(v) \text{Lie } I \subset \epsilon^n \text{Lie } I\}.$$

Note that C_n is obtained by imposing a condition on the relative position of the lattice $\text{Lie } I$ and the finitely generated $\mathcal{O}$ -module $\text{ad}(v) \text{Lie } I$.

In general we put $N = |R|$ and arrange the N values of r in weakly increasing order $r_1 \leq \dots \leq r_N$, and we then define a subset C_r of $\mathfrak{g}(F)$ as the set of v such that the relative position of the lattice $\text{Lie } I$ and the finitely generated $\mathcal{O}$ -module $\text{ad}(v)\text{Lie } I$ is less than or equal to $(r_1, \dots, r_N)$, in the sense that for all $i = 1, \dots, N$ the i -th exterior power of $\text{ad}(v)$ maps $\wedge^i(\text{Lie } I)$ into $\epsilon^{r_1 + \dots + r_i} \wedge^i(\text{Lie } I)$. Clearly C_r is Zariski closed and stable under the adjoint action of I ; moreover there exists an integer $M \gg 0$ such that $\epsilon^M \text{Lie } I \subset C_r \subset \epsilon^{-M} \text{Lie } I$. Using C_r , we then obtain another kind of generalized affine Springer fiber

$$(1.3) \quad Y_r(u) := \{g \in G(F)/I : g^{-1}ug \in C_r\}$$

adapted to the given root valuation function r . In Theorem 8.1 we show that the set (1.3) can be identified with the affine Weyl group when $u \in \mathfrak{a}(F)_r$.

One advantage of this construction is that it is canonical. Another is that we are now working inside the affine flag manifold, which is ind-proper. Consequently the set of $u \in \mathfrak{g}(F)$ for which (1.3) is non-empty is a closed $G(F)$ -invariant subset of $\mathfrak{g}(F)$ containing $\mathfrak{g}(F)_r$, and hence gives an upper bound for the closure of $\mathfrak{g}(F)_r$. Unfortunately Theorem 8.1 also says that for any other root valuation function r' such that $r'_i = r_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$, the fibers (1.3) over $u \in \mathfrak{g}(F)_{r'}$ are also non-empty, and such points do not lie in the closure of $\mathfrak{g}(F)_r$ unless r' lies in the W -orbit of r . It is likely that by refining our construction slightly, we could produce a variant of (1.3) that would be empty for $u \in \mathfrak{g}(F)_{r'}$ for r' as above, except when r' is in the W -orbit of r . At the moment, however, we see no reason to believe that the resulting improved upper bound for the closures of root valuation strata would turn out to be optimal. Therefore we have chosen to present our construction in its simplest form.

We finish our overview of the results in this paper by making two comments. The first is that in the body of the paper we also allow partial affine flag manifolds, for example, the affine Grassmannian.

The second concerns the more general notion of root valuation strata that was considered in [GKM]. These strata are indexed by certain pairs (w, r) consisting of an element w in the Weyl group and a function $R \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$. Nontrivial elements w arise when one studies regular semisimple elements in $\mathfrak{g}(F)$ whose centralizer in G is a nonsplit F -torus. To keep this paper as simple as possible we have chosen to ignore root valuation strata with nontrivial w (although we do know that our results on root valuation lattices can be extended to general w). Because we do not treat nontrivial w , we drop them from the notation and index the relevant strata simply by root valuation functions $r : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. This is justified by Proposition 4.8.3 in [GKM], whose content is that w is redundant when r takes values in $\mathbb{Z}$. Recently M. Sabitova [Sab] has proved the much more difficult result that w is always redundant when G is of classical type.

Now we discuss in greater detail the contents of the various sections of this paper. In order to prove Theorem 8.1 we need two kinds of input. The first is a linear (rather than σ -linear) version of Katz's Hodge-Newton decomposition that applies to all endomorphisms, not just invertible ones. This theory is developed in the first three sections of the paper, and along the way we prove yet another version of the Hodge-Newton decomposition, a linear one that makes sense for split connected reductive groups.

The second kind of input involves methods of recognizing points in the building of $G(F)$ that come from points in the building of a given Levi subgroup. For special

points such a result was proved in [Kot03], though there is an error in the proof given there (see Remark 5.5). For arbitrary points in the building we prove such a result in Corollary 5.4. In Theorem 6.2 we derive from Corollary 5.4 another way to recognize points in the building coming from a given Levi subgroup. It is Theorem 6.2 and our new kind of Hodge-Newton decomposition (Theorem 4.2) together that yield Theorem 8.1.

In section 7 we review root valuation functions and strata in greater detail. In section 8 we prove Theorem 8.1, which we have already discussed. Sections 9 and 10 provide material that will be needed in order to prove the Conjugation Theorem. In section 11 root valuation lattices are defined and characterized. In section 12 the Conjugation Theorem that we have already discussed is proved. The main idea in the proof already appears in the key Lemma 12.2, which is basically the induction step needed in our inductive proof of the Conjugation Theorem. Finally, in section 13 we prove that big root valuation lattices do exist; this involves some interesting root system combinatorics of a kind that was completely unfamiliar to us, related to the function r_m defined in that section.

In the first five sections there is no need to limit ourselves to $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{C}[[\epsilon]]$. Instead we work over a complete discrete valuation ring $\mathfrak{o}$. We denote by F the field of fractions of $\mathfrak{o}$ and choose an algebraic closure $\overline{F}$ of F . We also choose a uniformizing element $\varpi \in \mathfrak{o}$. The valuation $\text{val} : F^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ (normalized so that the valuation of ϖ is 1) extends uniquely to a valuation, still denoted by val , from $\overline{F}^\times$ onto $\mathbb{Q}$. Finally, we denote by k the residue field $\mathfrak{o}/\varpi\mathfrak{o}$.

Once we start to consider root valuation strata (section 7 and beyond), we will be working with the particular discrete valuation ring $\mathcal{O} := \mathbb{C}[[\epsilon]]$ and its fraction field $F = \mathbb{C}((\epsilon))$. Needless to say we could replace $\mathbb{C}$ by any algebraically closed field of characteristic 0 and nothing would change.

We warn the reader (and will repeat the warning later) that while $\mathfrak{a}$ usually denotes the Lie algebra of the maximal torus A , there is one section of the paper, namely section 5, in which we use $\mathfrak{a}$ to denote $X_*(A) \otimes \mathbb{R}$ instead. This should cause no confusion since the Lie algebra of A never arises in that section of the paper.

It is a pleasure to thank Sandeep Varma for his helpful comments on a preliminary version of this paper. The second author was partly supported by the SFB/TR 45 “Periods, Moduli Spaces and Arithmetic of Algebraic Varieties” of the DFG. She also gratefully acknowledges the hospitality of the University of Chicago during two visits, and the Hausdorff Center for Mathematics, Bonn for funding the second one.

2. SLOPES AND NEWTON HOMOMORPHISMS

2.1. Slopes. The roots in $\overline{F}$ of any irreducible polynomial with coefficients in F and nonzero constant term all have the same valuation. Therefore any monic polynomial f with coefficients in F and nonzero constant term factorizes uniquely as

$$(2.1) \quad f = \prod_{a \in \mathbb{Q}} f_a,$$

where f_a is a monic polynomial with coefficients in F all of whose roots in $\overline{F}$ have valuation a . We refer to this as the *slope factorization* of f .

Now consider a finite dimensional F -vector space V and an invertible linear transformation $T : V \rightarrow V$. We then have the slope factorization (2.1) of the

characteristic polynomial f of T . The Chinese remainder theorem then yields the *slope decomposition*

$$(2.2) \quad V = \bigoplus_{a \in \mathbb{Q}} V_a$$

with $V_a := \ker[f_a(T) : V \rightarrow V]$. Over $\overline{F}$ the subspace V_a is the direct sum of all the generalized eigenspaces for T on V obtained from eigenvalues having valuation a .

2.2. Newton homomorphisms. Let H be a linear algebraic group over F . Let $\mathbb{D} = \text{Spec } F[\mathbb{Q}]$ be the diagonalizable group scheme over F whose character group is $\mathbb{Q}$. To any $\gamma \in H(F)$ we are going to associate a Newton homomorphism $\nu_\gamma : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow H$ (defined over F). We use a Tannakian approach, as in section 4 of [Kot85].

Write $\text{Rep } H$ for the neutral Tannakian category of finite dimensional representations of H . For any V in $\text{Rep } H$ our element $\gamma \in H(F)$ acts on V by an automorphism that we will denote by γ_V . We then have the slope decomposition (2.2) with respect to γ_V .

In fact this construction lifts the canonical fiber functor on $\text{Rep } H$ to a $\otimes$ -functor from $\text{Rep } H$ to the tensor category of $\mathbb{Q}$ -graded F -vector spaces, or, in other words, we now have a $\otimes$ -functor $\text{Rep } H \rightarrow \text{Rep } \mathbb{D}$ that is strictly compatible with the canonical fiber functors on those two categories. By Tannakian theory this in turn yields an F -homomorphism $\nu_\gamma : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow H$, the *Newton homomorphism*, characterized as follows. Let R be any F -algebra and let $d \in \mathbb{D}(R)$. Thus d is a homomorphism $a \mapsto d_a$ from $\mathbb{Q}$ to $R^\times$. Then for any V in $\text{Rep } H$ and any $a \in \mathbb{Q}$ the automorphism $\nu_\gamma(d)_V$ of $V_R := V \otimes_F R$ acts by multiplication by d_a on the direct summand $(V_a)_R$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\varphi : H \rightarrow H'$ be a homomorphism between linear algebraic groups. Let $\gamma \in H(F)$ and let $\gamma' \in H'(F)$ denote its image under φ . Then $\nu_{\gamma'} = \varphi \circ \nu_\gamma$.*

Proof. Easy. □

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\gamma, \delta \in H(F)$. Let R be any F -algebra and suppose that $h \in H(R)$ satisfies $h\gamma h^{-1} = \delta$. Then $\text{Int}(h) \circ \nu_\gamma = \nu_\delta$, both sides of this equality being viewed as R -homomorphisms from $\mathbb{D}$ to H .*

Proof. It is harmless to assume that R is nonzero, in which case F injects into R . Consider V in $\text{Rep } H$. The equality $h\gamma h^{-1} = \delta$ implies that the characteristic polynomials of γ_V and δ_V are equal. By flatness of R over F the slope decomposition of V_R with respect to γ_V is

$$V_R = \bigoplus_{a \in \mathbb{Q}} \ker[f_a(\gamma_V) : V_R \rightarrow V_R]$$

and a similar statement holds for δ . The equality $h_V \gamma_V h_V^{-1} = \delta_V$ then implies that h_V transforms the slope decomposition for V_R with respect to γ_V into the one with respect to δ_V . Since this is true for all V in $\text{Rep } H$, we conclude that $\text{Int}(h) \circ \nu_\gamma = \nu_\delta$. □

Corollary 2.3. *The centralizer H_γ of γ in H is contained in the centralizer M of ν_γ in H . In particular γ lies in $M(F)$.*

Proof. Clear. □

Definition 2.4. Say that $\gamma \in H(F)$ is *basic* if its Newton homomorphism $\nu_\gamma : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow H$ factors through the center of H .

Remark 2.5. With notation as in the previous corollary, the Newton homomorphism is central in M , and therefore γ is basic in $M(F)$.

2.3. Newton homomorphisms for tori. Let T be a torus over F . We may restrict the homomorphism

$$T(\bar{F}) = X_*(T) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \bar{F}^{\times} \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \text{val}} X_*(T) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$$

to $T(F)$, obtaining a homomorphism

$$(2.3) \quad T(F) \rightarrow X_*(A_T)_{\mathbb{Q}},$$

where A_T is the maximal split subtorus of T .

Proposition 2.6. *Let $\gamma \in T(F)$. Then $\nu_{\gamma} \in \text{Hom}(\mathbb{D}, T) = X_*(A_T)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is the image of γ under the homomorphism (2.3).*

Proof. When T is split, the proposition follows directly from the Tannakian definition of Newton homomorphisms. In general one uses the homomorphism from T to its biggest split quotient in order to reduce to the split case. Of course one must appeal to Lemma 2.1. $\square$

2.4. Newton points. Now assume that H is connected and reductive. Choose a maximal F -split torus A in H . The group $\Omega := \text{Norm}_{H(F)} A / \text{Cent}_{H(F)} A$ then acts on $X_*(A)_{\mathbb{Q}} = \text{Hom}(\mathbb{D}, A)$, and the natural map $\text{Hom}(\mathbb{D}, A) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathbb{D}, H)$ induces a bijection from the set of Ω -orbits in $X_*(A)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ to the set of $H(F)$ -conjugacy classes of homomorphisms $\mathbb{D} \rightarrow H$. Lemma 2.2 shows that the $H(F)$ -conjugacy class of ν_{γ} depends only on the $H(F)$ -conjugacy class of γ and yields a well-defined orbit of Ω in $X_*(A)_{\mathbb{Q}}$, the *Newton point* $[\nu_{\gamma}]$ of (the $H(F)$ -conjugacy class of) γ .

3. GROUP-THEORETIC LINEAR HODGE-NEWTON DECOMPOSITIONS

The purpose of this section is to prove a linear (as opposed to σ -linear) version of the group-theoretic generalization (see [KR, Remark 4.12] and [Kot03, Vie08]) of Katz's Hodge-Newton decomposition [Kat79]. In the case of GL_n (the situation considered by Katz, though his paper is written in the language of linear algebra rather than that of group theory) we generalize the result in a different direction, treating all endomorphisms of a given finite dimensional vector space, not just the invertible ones. This added generality will be needed later, when we apply our linear Hodge-Newton decomposition to endomorphisms of the form $\text{ad}(u)$.

3.1. Notation pertaining to split G . For the rest of this section we let G be a split connected reductive group over $\mathfrak{o}$ and let A be a split maximal torus of G over $\mathfrak{o}$. Fix a Borel subgroup $B = AU$ containing A with unipotent radical U . As usual, by a standard parabolic subgroup P of G we mean one containing B , and we write $P = MN$, where M is the unique Levi subgroup of P containing A and N is the unipotent radical of P .

Taking scheme theoretic closures, we obtain natural $\mathfrak{o}$ -structures on B, U, P, M, N for which B is a Borel subscheme of G over $\mathfrak{o}$, M is a split connected reductive group scheme over $\mathfrak{o}$, and so on. A fact that will be useful later is that P is the semidirect product of M and N over $\mathfrak{o}$, so that in particular we have $P(\mathfrak{o}) = M(\mathfrak{o})N(\mathfrak{o})$.

We write Λ_G for the quotient of $X_*(A)$ by the coroot lattice for G , and we write p_G for the canonical surjection $X_*(A) \twoheadrightarrow \Lambda_G$. We recall that there is a natural surjective homomorphism $w_G : G(F) \twoheadrightarrow \Lambda_G$, which can be defined as follows. For

$g \in G(F)$ we define $r_B(g) \in X_*(A)$ to be the unique element $\mu \in X_*(A)$ such that $g \in G(\mathfrak{o})\mu(\varpi)U(F)$, and we define $w_G(g)$ to be the image of $r_B(g)$ under the canonical surjection p_G .

Applying the construction above to M rather than G , we obtain Λ_M , the quotient of $X_*(A)$ by the coroot lattice for M , and homomorphisms $p_M : X_*(A) \rightarrow \Lambda_M$ and $w_M : M(F) \rightarrow \Lambda_M$. For $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda_M$ we write $\mu \stackrel{P}{\leq} \nu$ if $\nu - \mu$ is a non-negative integral linear combination of (images in Λ_M of) coroots $\alpha^\vee$, where α ranges over the roots of A in N .

3.2. Newton points in the split case. In what follows we will be using Newton points for our split connected reductive group G . Then the Newton point $[\nu_\gamma]$ can be viewed either as a Weyl group orbit in $X_*(A)_\mathbb{Q}$, or as a dominant element in $X_*(A)_\mathbb{Q}$. We will use the two points of view interchangeably.

Example 3.1. Suppose that our split group is actually a split torus A . Then the Newton homomorphism $\nu_\gamma \in \text{Hom}(\mathbb{D}, A) = X_*(A)_\mathbb{Q}$ is equal to the image of $w_A(\gamma) \in X_*(A)$ under the canonical inclusion $X_*(A) \hookrightarrow X_*(A)_\mathbb{Q}$.

In general there is still some relationship between $w_G(\gamma)$ and ν_γ , as we will now see. For this we need the $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear map

$$(3.1) \quad X_*(A)_\mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \Lambda_G \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$$

induced by the canonical surjection $X_*(A) \rightarrow \Lambda_G$, as well as the canonical homomorphism

$$(3.2) \quad \Lambda_G \rightarrow \Lambda_G \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}.$$

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\gamma \in G(F)$. Then the image of $[\nu_\gamma]$ under (3.1) is equal to the image of $w_G(\gamma)$ under (3.2).*

Proof. Let C be the split torus obtained as the quotient of G by its derived group. The functoriality of Newton homomorphisms (Lemma 2.1), together with the commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G(F) & \longrightarrow & C(F) \\ w_G \downarrow & & w_C \downarrow \\ \Lambda_G & \longrightarrow & \Lambda_C \end{array}$$

reduces us to the case in which our group is a split torus, and this has already been discussed in Example 3.1. $\square$

Corollary 3.3. *Assume that $\gamma \in G(F)$ is basic, so that its Newton homomorphism ν_γ lies in $\text{Hom}(\mathbb{D}, A_G)$, where A_G is the identity component of the center of G . Then under the canonical isomorphism*

$$\text{Hom}(\mathbb{D}, A_G) \simeq X_*(A_G)_\mathbb{Q} \simeq \Lambda_G \otimes \mathbb{Q}$$

ν_γ corresponds to the image of $w_G(\gamma)$ under (3.2). Thus, in the basic case, ν_γ is uniquely determined by $w_G(\gamma)$.

Proof. Clear. $\square$

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\gamma \in G(F)$ and let $\gamma_s \in G(\bar{F})$ denote semisimple part of the Jordan decomposition of γ . Choose $a \in A(\bar{F})$ such that a is conjugate to γ_s in*

$G(\bar{F})$. The Weyl group orbit of a is then uniquely determined by γ , and the Newton point of γ is the Weyl group orbit of the image of a under

$$A(\bar{F}) = X_*(A) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \bar{F}^{\times} \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \text{val}} X_*(A) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}.$$

Proof. We first reduce to the case in which γ is semisimple. In characteristic 0, the Jordan decomposition of γ is defined over F , and it is evident from the definition of ν_{γ} that $\nu_{\gamma_s} = \nu_{\gamma}$. In characteristic p we use instead the fact that γ^m is semisimple when m is a sufficiently big power of the prime p , it being again evident that $\nu_{\gamma^m} = m\nu_{\gamma}$.

Now assume that γ is semisimple. Choose a maximal F -torus T of G containing γ . Then the proposition follows from Proposition 2.6. $\square$

3.3. Linear Hodge-Newton decomposition. For any coweight $\mu \in X_*(A)$ (usually taken to be dominant) and any $\gamma \in G(F)$ we consider the set

$$(3.3) \quad X_{\mu}^G(\gamma) := \{x \in G(F)/G(\mathfrak{o}) : x^{-1}\gamma x \in G(\mathfrak{o})\mu(\varpi)G(\mathfrak{o})\}.$$

Theorem 3.5. *Let $\mu \in X_*(A)$ be a dominant coweight, let $P = MN$ be a standard parabolic subgroup, and let $\gamma \in M(F)$. Then the following two conclusions hold:*

- (1) *If $X_{\mu}^G(\gamma)$ is non-empty, then $w_M(\gamma) \stackrel{P}{\leq} p_M(\mu)$.*
- (2) *Suppose that $w_M(\gamma) = p_M(\mu)$ and that every slope of $\text{Ad}(\gamma)$ on $\text{Lie } N$ is strictly positive. Then the natural injection $X_{\mu}^M(\gamma) \hookrightarrow X_{\mu}^G(\gamma)$ is a bijection.*

The theorem will be proved at the end of this section. The second part of the theorem is our linear group-theoretic generalization of Katz's Hodge-Newton decomposition (see Theorem 1.6.1 of [Kat79]). From the first part of the theorem we obtain the following corollary, which is analogous to the group-theoretic generalization of Mazur's inequality (see Theorem 1.4.1 of [Kat79]) proved by Rapoport-Richartz [RR96].

Corollary 3.6. *Let μ be a dominant coweight, let $\gamma \in G(F)$, and write $[\nu_{\gamma}]$ for the B -dominant element in $X_*(A)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ obtained as the Newton point of γ . Suppose further that $X_{\mu}^G(\gamma)$ is non-empty. Then $[\nu_{\gamma}] \leq \mu$ in the sense that $\mu - [\nu_{\gamma}]$ is a non-negative real linear combination of simple coroots. Moreover $w_G(\gamma) = p_G(\mu)$.*

Proof. The Newton homomorphism ν_{γ} of γ determines a parabolic subgroup $P = MN$, characterized by the following two properties: M is the centralizer of ν_{γ} in G , and $\mathbb{D}$ acts (through ν_{γ}) on $\text{Lie } N$ with strictly positive weights. It is harmless to replace γ by a $G(F)$ -conjugate, so we may assume that P is standard.

As we have already seen in Corollary 2.3, γ lies in $M(F)$ and is basic for M . By Corollary 3.3, under the canonical isomorphism

$$\text{Hom}(\mathbb{D}, A_M) \simeq X_*(A_M)_{\mathbb{Q}} \simeq \Lambda_M \otimes \mathbb{Q}$$

ν_{γ} corresponds to the image of $w_M(\gamma)$ under $\Lambda_M \rightarrow \Lambda_M \otimes \mathbb{Q}$, and from the first part of Theorem 3.5 we conclude that $[\nu_{\gamma}] \leq \mu$. Here we used standard facts (see, e.g., Lemma 4.9 in [Kot03]) relating the partial order $\leq$ on $X_*(A)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ to the one on Λ_M .

The last statement of the corollary is obtained by choosing $g \in G(F)$ such that $g^{-1}\gamma g \in G(\mathfrak{o})\mu(\varpi)G(\mathfrak{o})$ and then observing that

$$w_G(\gamma) = w_G(g^{-1}\gamma g) = w_G(\mu(\varpi)) = p_G(\mu).$$

$\square$

3.4. Two lemmas. We now give two lemmas that will be needed in the proof of the theorem we just stated. These lemmas are similar to Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 in [Kot03].

Lemma 3.7. *Let V be a finite dimensional F -vector space, and let $T : V \rightarrow V$ be an invertible linear transformation all of whose slopes are strictly positive. Suppose that Λ is a lattice in V such that $T\Lambda \subset \Lambda$. Then $1 - T : V \rightarrow V$ is bijective and moreover $(1 - T)\Lambda = \Lambda$. In particular, if $v \in V$ satisfies $v - Tv \in \Lambda$, then $v \in \Lambda$.*

Proof. Clearly $(1 - T)\Lambda \subset \Lambda$. Let $f(\lambda) = \lambda^d + a_1\lambda^{d-1} + \dots + a_d$ be the characteristic polynomial of T , d being the dimension of V . Our hypothesis on the slopes guarantees that $a_1, \dots, a_d$ all lie in the maximal ideal $\varpi\mathfrak{o}$. Therefore $\det(1 - T) = f(1)$ lies in $1 + \varpi\mathfrak{o} \subset \mathfrak{o}^\times$. It is then clear that $1 - T$ is bijective from V to V and from Λ to Λ . $\square$

The second lemma is a non-abelian analog of the first. It makes use of the notation in subsection 3.1, in particular the Borel subgroup B containing A .

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\mu \in X_*(A)$ be a coweight that is dominant with respect to our chosen B , and let $P = MN$ be a standard parabolic subgroup. We consider elements $\gamma \in M(F)$ and $n \in N(F)$ satisfying $n^{-1}\gamma n\gamma^{-1} \in N(\mathfrak{o})$. We further assume that $\gamma \in M(\mathfrak{o})\mu(\varpi)M(\mathfrak{o})$ and that every slope of $\text{Ad}(\gamma)$ on $\text{Lie } N$ is strictly positive. The conclusion is then that $n \in N(\mathfrak{o})$.*

Proof. We claim that $\gamma N(\mathfrak{o})\gamma^{-1} \subset N(\mathfrak{o})$. Indeed, this follows from our hypothesis that $\gamma \in M(\mathfrak{o})\mu(\varpi)M(\mathfrak{o})$. Here we used that $M(\mathfrak{o})$ normalizes $N(\mathfrak{o})$ and that $\mu(\varpi)N(\mathfrak{o})\mu(\varpi)^{-1} \subset N(\mathfrak{o})$, a consequence of the fact that μ is dominant.

Choose an M -stable filtration

$$(3.4) \quad N = N_0 \supset N_1 \supset N_2 \supset \dots \supset N_r = \{1\}$$

by normal subgroups with N_i/N_{i+1} abelian for all i . Each N_i is A -stable, hence is a product of root subgroups (even over $\mathfrak{o}$). We will prove by induction on i ($0 \leq i \leq r$) that $n \in N_i(F)N(\mathfrak{o})$. For $i = 0$ this statement is trivial, and for $i = r$ it is the statement of the lemma. It remains to do the induction step. So suppose that for $0 \leq i < r$ we can write n as $n = n_i n_\mathfrak{o}$ for $n_i \in N_i(F)$ and $n_\mathfrak{o} \in N(\mathfrak{o})$. Then $n_i^{-1}\gamma n_i\gamma^{-1} \in N_i(\mathfrak{o})$. By Lemma 3.7, applied to the F -vector space $(N_i/N_{i+1})(F) \cong \text{Lie } N_i / \text{Lie } N_{i+1}$ and the linear transformation given by conjugation by γ , the image of n_i in $(N_i/N_{i+1})(F)$ lies in $(N_i/N_{i+1})(\mathfrak{o})$. Since $N_i(\mathfrak{o})$ maps onto $(N_i/N_{i+1})(\mathfrak{o})$, we see that n_i can be written as $n_{i+1}n'_\mathfrak{o}$ with $n_{i+1} \in N_{i+1}(F)$ and $n'_\mathfrak{o} \in N_i(\mathfrak{o})$. Thus $n = n_{i+1} \cdot (n'_\mathfrak{o} n_\mathfrak{o}) \in N_{i+1}(F)N(\mathfrak{o})$, as desired. $\square$

3.5. Proof of Theorem 3.5. Now we are ready to prove Theorem 3.5. The proof is exactly parallel to that of Theorem 1.1 in [Kot03]. Let $g \in G(F)$ and suppose that

$$(3.5) \quad g^{-1}\gamma g \in G(\mathfrak{o})\mu(\varpi)G(\mathfrak{o}).$$

Use the Iwasawa decomposition to write g as mnk for $m \in M(F)$, $n \in N(F)$ and $k \in G(\mathfrak{o})$. It follows from (3.5) that

$$(3.6) \quad n_1 m_1 \in G(\mathfrak{o})\mu(\varpi)G(\mathfrak{o}),$$

where $m_1 := m^{-1}\gamma m \in M(F)$ and $n_1 := n^{-1}m_1 n m_1^{-1} \in N(F)$. We claim that

$$(3.7) \quad w_M(\gamma) = p_M(r_B(n_1 m_1)).$$

Indeed,

$$w_M(\gamma) = w_M(m_1) = p_M(r_{B \cap M}(m_1)) = p_M(r_B(n_1 m_1)).$$

Using equation (2.6) in section 2.6 of [Kot03], together with (3.6) and (3.7) above, we conclude that $w_M(\gamma) \stackrel{P}{\leq} p_M(\mu)$, which proves the first part of the theorem.

Now we prove the second part of the theorem. Under the hypotheses that $w_M(\gamma) = p_M(\mu)$ and that all the slopes of $\text{Ad}(\gamma)$ on $\text{Lie } N(F)$ are strictly positive (and with g, m, n, m_1, n_1 as above), we begin by proving that $g \in M(F)G(\mathfrak{o})$. It follows from (3.6), (3.7), our assumption $w_M(\gamma) = p_M(\mu)$, and Lemma 2.2 of [Kot03] that $n_1 m_1 \in G(\mathfrak{o})M(F)$. Therefore $n_1 \in G(\mathfrak{o})M(F)$, say $n_1 = k_2 m_2$ with $k_2 \in G(\mathfrak{o})$ and $m_2 \in M(F)$. Then $n_1 m_2^{-1} \in P(\mathfrak{o})$, and therefore $n_1 \in N(\mathfrak{o})$ and $m_2 \in M(\mathfrak{o})$. Since $n_1 \in N(\mathfrak{o})$, the second statement of Lemma 2.2 of [Kot03] applies to $n_1 m_1$, and hence $m_1 \in M(\mathfrak{o})\mu(\varpi)M(\mathfrak{o})$.

Now applying Lemma 3.8 (not to the element γ , but to its conjugate m_1 , which satisfies all the hypotheses of that lemma), we see that $n \in N(\mathfrak{o})$. Therefore $g = m \cdot nk \in M(F)G(\mathfrak{o})$, and we are done, since we have already seen that

$$(3.8) \quad m^{-1} \gamma m = m_1 \in M(\mathfrak{o})\mu(\varpi)M(\mathfrak{o}),$$

which shows that $g \in X_\mu^G(\gamma)$ is the image of $m \in X_\mu^M(\gamma)$. $\square$

4. LINEAR HODGE-NEWTON DECOMPOSITION FOR ENDOMORPHISMS

The results of the previous section were proved for split groups G . For $G = GL_n$ they yield concrete assertions in linear algebra, in particular a linear Hodge-Newton decomposition for certain triples (V, T, Λ) consisting of a finite dimensional F -vector space V , a linear bijection $T : V \rightarrow V$, and a lattice Λ in V . This will be the content of Theorem 4.2, a close relative of Katz's σ -linear Hodge-Newton decomposition [Kat79]. However, in Theorem 4.2 we actually work in greater generality, in that we drop the requirement that T be invertible, allowing T to be an arbitrary endomorphism of V . This will require us to use slopes in $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}} := \mathbb{Q} \cup \{\infty\}$, not just $\mathbb{Q}$, and so we must begin with some preliminary remarks about valuations and slopes.

4.1. Extended valuation map $\text{val} : \overline{F} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{Q}}$. We extend $\text{val} : \overline{F}^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ to $\text{val} : \overline{F} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{Q}}$ by putting $\text{val}(0) = \infty$. This extended valuation map is a homomorphism of monoids, using field multiplication on $\overline{F}$ and the usual addition on $\mathbb{Q}$ together with the rules $x + \infty = \infty + x = \infty$ for all x in $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}$. We will also use the convention that $\varpi^\infty = 0$.

The usual partial order on $\mathbb{Q}$ extends to a total order on $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}$ for which ∞ is the greatest element.

4.2. Slopes and Newton points. Let T be an endomorphism of an n -dimensional F -vector space. Then T has n eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ in $\overline{F}$. The *slopes* of T are the n elements $\nu_i = \text{val}(\lambda_i)$ of $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}$. Renumbering the slopes so that $\nu_1 \leq \nu_2 \leq \dots \leq \nu_n$, we obtain the *Newton point*

$$\nu(T) := (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$$

of T . The Newton point lies in $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}_+^n$, the subset of $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}^n$ consisting of non-decreasing n -tuples.

4.3. Hodge points. Now let T be an endomorphism of an n -dimensional vector space V , and let Λ be a lattice in V (an $\mathfrak{o}$ -submodule of V that is free of rank n). Since T need not be invertible, $T\Lambda$ need not be a lattice in V , but it certainly is a finitely generated $\mathfrak{o}$ -submodule of V , and therefore there exists an $\mathfrak{o}$ -basis $e_1, \dots, e_n$ for Λ and n elements $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_n$ of $\mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$ such that

$$(4.1) \quad T\Lambda = \mathfrak{o}\varpi^{\mu_1}e_1 + \dots + \mathfrak{o}\varpi^{\mu_n}e_n.$$

We are of course making use of our convention that $\varpi^\infty = 0$. In this way we obtain the *Hodge point*

$$\mu(T, \Lambda) := (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$$

of (T, Λ) (independent of the choice of basis for which (4.1) holds). When necessary for the sake of clarity, we will denote the i -th entry of the n -tuple $\mu(T, \Lambda)$ by $\mu_i(T, \Lambda)$ rather than μ_i , and the same goes for $\nu(T)$. It is worth noting that the number of entries of μ that are finite is equal to the rank of T .

For any $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and any $a \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$, the inequality $\mu_1 + \dots + \mu_i \geq a$ is equivalent to the condition that the linear transformation $\wedge^i T : \wedge^i V \rightarrow \wedge^i V$ map the lattice $\wedge^i \Lambda$ into $\varpi^a \wedge^i \Lambda$. An even more concrete version of this is obtained by choosing an $\mathfrak{o}$ -basis for Λ , which also serves as F -basis for V and allows us to regard T as an $n \times n$ -matrix. The matrix entries of $\wedge^i T$ are then the $i \times i$ -minors of T , and the inequality $\mu_1 + \dots + \mu_i \geq a$ is also equivalent to the condition that every $i \times i$ -minor of T lies in $\varpi^a \mathfrak{o}$.

4.4. Openness lemma for Hodge points. Recall that F can be regarded as a topological field. In this topology the sets $\varpi^a \mathfrak{o}$ ($a \in \mathbb{Z}$) form a neighborhood base at the point 0, and each such subset is both open and closed in F . For any affine scheme $X = \text{Spec}(A)$ of finite type over F (A being a finitely generated F -algebra) the set $X(F)$ then acquires a natural topology: the smallest one (fewest open sets) for which the functions $f : X(F) \rightarrow F$ obtained from elements in the F -algebra A are all continuous. Any morphism $X \rightarrow X'$ then induces a continuous map $X(F) \rightarrow X'(F)$. In particular any finite dimensional F -vector space acquires a natural topology; for example $F^n = \mathbb{A}^n(F)$ acquires the usual product topology.

Lemma 4.1. *Let Λ be a lattice in an n -dimensional F -vector space V . Let $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and let $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then the subsets*

$$\{T \in \text{End}_F V : \mu_1(T, \Lambda) + \dots + \mu_i(T, \Lambda) \geq a\}$$

$$\{T \in \text{End}_F V : \mu_1(T, \Lambda) + \dots + \mu_i(T, \Lambda) = a\}$$

are open and closed in $\text{End}_F V$.

Proof. That the first set is open and closed follows from the description of $\mu(T, \Lambda)$ given at the end of the last subsection. Since the second set is the difference of two sets of the first kind, it too is open and closed. $\square$

4.5. Dominance order on $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}_+^n$. For $\mu, \nu \in \tilde{\mathbb{Q}}_+^n$ we say that $\mu \geq \nu$ if

$$(4.2) \quad \mu_1 + \dots + \mu_i \leq \nu_1 + \dots + \nu_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n-1$$

and

$$(4.3) \quad \mu_1 + \dots + \mu_i = \nu_1 + \dots + \nu_i \quad \text{for } i = n.$$

The direction of the inequality in (4.2) reflects our convention of considering *increasing* sequences $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \cdots \leq \mu_n$ to be dominant, or, in other words, of taking the standard Borel subgroup in GL_n be *lower* triangular.

4.6. Hodge-Newton decomposition for (V, T, Λ) . In the next theorem the first part is an analog of Mazur's inequality and the second part is an analog of Katz's Hodge-Newton decomposition.

Theorem 4.2. *Let V be an n -dimensional F -vector space, let $T : V \rightarrow V$ be a linear transformation, and let Λ be a lattice in V . Put $\mu = \mu(T, \Lambda)$ and $\nu = \nu(T)$. Then the following two conclusions hold.*

- (1) $\nu(T) \leq \mu(T, \Lambda)$.
- (2) *Suppose that V is the direct sum of linear subspaces U, W having the property that $TU \subset U$ and $TW \subset W$. Suppose further that every slope of T on U is strictly less than every slope of T on W . Finally, put $r = \dim U$ and suppose that $\mu_1 + \cdots + \mu_r = \nu_1 + \cdots + \nu_r$. Then Λ decomposes as*

$$\Lambda = (\Lambda \cap U) \oplus (\Lambda \cap W).$$

Proof. We will first prove the theorem in the special case that T is invertible, deriving it from the case $G = GL_n$ of our group theoretic linear Hodge-Newton decomposition. We will then derive the general case from this special one, perturbing T by a suitably small non-zero scalar in such a way that the perturbed linear transformation is invertible and that (1),(2) for it imply (1),(2) for T .

So for the moment we assume that T is invertible. Choose any F -basis for V , and use it to identify V with F^n and the algebraic group $GL_F V$ with $G = GL_n$. Choose $g \in G(F)/G(\mathfrak{o})$ such that $\Lambda = g\mathfrak{o}^n$. Our linear transformation T is now an element $\gamma \in G(F)$, and μ (which lies in $\mathbb{Z}^n$ and satisfies $\mu_1 \leq \cdots \leq \mu_n$) can be viewed as a coweight of the diagonal maximal torus A in G that is dominant with respect to the *lower* triangular Borel subgroup B of G ; moreover we have $g^{-1}\gamma g \in G(\mathfrak{o})\mu(\varpi)G(\mathfrak{o})$. Corollary 3.6 tells us that $[\nu_\gamma] \leq \mu$ in the dominance order for B , and this is the content of (1).

For (2) we choose our basis $e_1, \dots, e_n$ for V in such a way that the first r elements form a basis for U and the remaining $n - r$ elements form a basis for W . Still taking B to be the lower triangular Borel subgroup, we obtain a standard parabolic subgroup $P = MN$ with P consisting of elements g in G such that $gW = W$, and M consisting of elements g such that $gU = U$ and $gW = W$. Then $\gamma = T \in M(F)$, and our hypothesis that the slopes of γ on U are strictly smaller than those on W is equivalent to the statement that every slope of $\text{Ad}(\gamma)$ on $\text{Lie } N$ is strictly positive. The hypothesis that $\mu_1 + \cdots + \mu_r = \nu_1 + \cdots + \nu_r$ is equivalent to the hypothesis that $w_M(\gamma) = p_M(\mu)$ (bear in mind that the equality $\mu_1 + \cdots + \mu_n = \nu_1 + \cdots + \nu_n$ is automatic). As before we choose $g \in G(F)$ such that $\Lambda = g\mathfrak{o}^n$. Then $gG(\mathfrak{o})$ lies in $X_\mu^G(\gamma)$, and thus Theorem 3.5(2) tells us that $g \in M(F)G(\mathfrak{o})$, which implies that

$$\Lambda = (\Lambda \cap U) \oplus (\Lambda \cap W),$$

as desired.

So now we know that the theorem is true when T is invertible. For a general endomorphism T our method will be to perturb T slightly, replacing it by $\tilde{T} = T + c$ for suitably small $c \in F$ with $c \neq 0$. We will do this in such a way that $\tilde{T}$ is invertible and the statements of the theorem for $\tilde{T}$ imply those for T . Put $\tilde{\mu} = \mu(\tilde{T}, \Lambda)$ and $\tilde{\nu} = \nu(\tilde{T})$; these of course depend on c .

We begin with (1). We must show that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$

$$(4.4) \quad \mu_1 + \dots + \mu_i \leq \nu_1 + \dots + \nu_i.$$

and that

$$\mu_1 + \dots + \mu_n = \nu_1 + \dots + \nu_n.$$

Let us start by verifying the last equality. We have already handled the case in which T is invertible, and if T is not invertible then it is clear from the definitions that both sides of the equality are infinite.

Next we prove the inequality (4.4). If its right side is infinite, the inequality is trivially true, so we may as well assume that it is finite. Then the rank of T is at least i , so that $\mu_1 + \dots + \mu_i$ is finite as well. By Lemma 4.1, for all sufficiently small $c \in F$ we have

$$\mu_1 + \dots + \mu_i = \tilde{\mu}_1 + \dots + \tilde{\mu}_i.$$

The eigenvalues of $\tilde{T}$ are obtained from those of T by adding c . Therefore, for all sufficiently small $c \in F$, $c \neq 0$, the perturbed linear transformation $\tilde{T}$ is invertible and

$$\nu_1 + \dots + \nu_i = \tilde{\nu}_1 + \dots + \tilde{\nu}_i.$$

Since $\tilde{T}$ is invertible, (1) holds for it, which means that

$$\tilde{\mu}_1 + \dots + \tilde{\mu}_i \leq \tilde{\nu}_1 + \dots + \tilde{\nu}_i.$$

and therefore the inequality (4.4) follows.

It remains to prove (2). The case $W = 0$ being trivial, we may as well assume that $r < n$. Since every slope of T on U is strictly less than every slope of T on W , the slopes of T on U (resp. W) are $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_r$ (resp. $\nu_{r+1}, \dots, \nu_n$), and we have

$$\nu_1 \leq \dots \leq \nu_r < \nu_{r+1} \leq \dots \leq \nu_n,$$

from which we conclude that all of $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_r$ are finite. This implies that the rank of T is at least r and hence that $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r$ are also finite. From Lemma 4.1 it follows that when c is sufficiently small, there is an equality

$$\mu_1 + \dots + \mu_r = \tilde{\mu}_1 + \dots + \tilde{\mu}_r.$$

For any $c \in \mathfrak{o}$ we have $\tilde{T}U \subset U$ and $\tilde{T}W \subset W$. For sufficiently small c the valuations of the eigenvalues of $\tilde{T}$ on U will be the same as those of T on U , namely $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_r$, and for sufficiently small non-zero c the eigenvalues of $\tilde{T}$ on W will be non-zero with valuation strictly greater than ν_r ; when both of these things happen, we will have

$$\nu_1 + \dots + \nu_r = \tilde{\nu}_1 + \dots + \tilde{\nu}_r,$$

with equality actually holding term-by-term. Thus we see that when c is sufficiently small and non-zero, $\tilde{T}$ satisfies all the hypotheses of our theorem (for the given Λ, U, W), invertibility being ensured by having no eigenvalue equal to 0. Applying the theorem to $\tilde{T}$, we conclude that

$$\Lambda = (\Lambda \cap U) \oplus (\Lambda \cap W),$$

as desired. □

5. RECOGNIZING ELEMENTS IN THE SUBSET $\mathcal{BT}_M$ OF $\mathcal{BT}_G$

5.1. Notation. Let G be a split connected reductive group over F , and let A be a split maximal torus of G over F . We write A_G for the split torus obtained as the identity component of the center of G . We denote by $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(A)$ the set of Borel subgroups of G containing A . For $B = AU \in \mathcal{B}$ (U being the unipotent radical of B) we denote by $\bar{B} = A\bar{U}$ the Borel subgroup in $\mathcal{B}$ that is opposite to B .

Let M be a Levi subgroup of G containing A . We write $\mathcal{P}(M)$ for the (finite) set of parabolic F -subgroups of G admitting M as Levi component. For $P = MN \in \mathcal{P}(M)$, we write R_M (respectively, R_N) for the set of roots of A in M (respectively, N), and we write $\bar{P} = M\bar{N}$ for the parabolic subgroup in $\mathcal{P}(M)$ that is opposite to P . We denote by Λ_M the quotient of $X_*(A)$ by the coroot lattice for M , and by $p_M : X_*(A) \rightarrow \Lambda_M$ the canonical surjection. Finally, we extend scalars to $\mathbb{R}$, obtaining a linear map

$$\mathfrak{a} := X_*(A) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \Lambda_M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} =: \mathfrak{a}_M$$

which will still be denoted p_M . When $M = A$ we have $\mathfrak{a}_A = \mathfrak{a}$, and in this case we will always suppress the subscript. It is only in this section of the paper that we will use the notation $\mathfrak{a}$ in this way; in subsequent sections $\mathfrak{a}$ will always denote the Lie algebra of A .

5.2. Review of Arthur's (G, M) -orthogonal sets. Let M be a Levi subgroup containing A . For adjacent $P = MN$, $P' = MN'$ in $\mathcal{P}(M)$ we consider the collection of elements in $\mathfrak{a}_M$ obtained as images of coroots $\alpha^\vee$ with $\alpha \in R_N \cap R_{\bar{N}'}$. Let $\beta_{P,P'}$ denote the unique member of this collection of which all other members are positive multiples. In case $M = A$, so that P, P' are Borel subgroups, $\beta_{P,P'}$ is the unique coroot of A that is positive for P and negative for P' .

Recall (see [Art76]) that a family of points x_P in $\mathfrak{a}_M$, one for each $P \in \mathcal{P}(M)$, is said to be a (G, M) -orthogonal set if for every pair $P, P' \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ of adjacent parabolic subgroups there exists a real number r (necessarily unique) such that

$$x_P - x_{P'} = r\beta_{P,P'}.$$

When all the numbers r are non-negative (respectively, non-positive), the (G, M) -orthogonal set is said to be *positive* (respectively, *negative*). Note that these concepts still make sense when $\mathfrak{a}_M$ is replaced by its underlying affine space, since the difference of two elements in that affine space is a well-defined element of the vector space $\mathfrak{a}_M$.

Let $P \in \mathcal{P}(M)$, and let $x = (x_B)_{B \in \mathcal{B}}$ be a (G, A) -orthogonal set. The map $B \mapsto B \cap M$ identifies $\{B \in \mathcal{B}(A) : B \subset P\}$ with $\mathcal{B}^M(A)$, the set of Borel subgroups in M containing A . The points $(x_B)_{\{B \in \mathcal{B}(A) : B \subset P\}}$ form an (M, A) -orthogonal set and thus have the same image, call it y_P , in $\mathfrak{a}_M$. The family $y = (y_P)_{P \in \mathcal{P}(M)}$ is then a (G, M) -orthogonal set in $\mathfrak{a}_M$, positive if (x_B) is, and is called the (G, M) -orthogonal set *associated* to x .

5.3. Recognizing positive (G, A) -orthogonal sets coming from M . In the next lemma, which proves the equivalence of five conditions on a positive (G, A) -orthogonal set x , the main point is that the seemingly weak condition (4) implies the rather strong condition (1). When these five equivalent conditions hold, we say that x *comes from M* .

Lemma 5.1. *Let $x = (x_B)_{B \in \mathcal{B}}$ be a positive (G, A) -orthogonal set, and let $y = (y_P)_{P \in \mathcal{P}(M)}$ be the positive (G, M) -orthogonal set associated to x . Then the following five conditions on x are equivalent.*

- (1) *There exists a positive (M, A) -orthogonal set $z = (z_{B_M})_{B_M \in \mathcal{B}^M(A)}$ such that $x_B = z_{B \cap M}$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(A)$.*
- (2) *$p_M(x_{B_1}) = p_M(x_{B_2})$ for all $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}(A)$.*
- (3) *$y_{P_1} = y_{P_2}$ for all $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{P}(M)$.*
- (4) *There exists $P \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ such that $y_P = y_{\bar{P}}$.*
- (5) *$x_{B'} = x_{B''}$ when B', B'' are adjacent and $\beta_{B', B''}$ is not a coroot of M .*

Proof. It is clear that (1) implies (2): the points z_{B_M} have the same image in $\mathfrak{a}_M$, so the same is true of the points x_B .

Next we check that (2) implies (3). For $i = 1, 2$ choose $B_i \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $B_i \subset P_i$. Then

$$y_{P_1} = p_M(x_{B_1}) = p_M(x_{B_2}) = y_{P_2}.$$

After noting that (3) clearly implies (4), we next show that (4) implies (5). Choose some $B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $B \subset P$. (This amounts to choosing an element in $\mathcal{B}^M(A)$.) It then follows that $\bar{B} \subset \bar{P}$. Note that

$$p_M(x_B) = y_P = y_{\bar{P}} = p_M(x_{\bar{B}}),$$

which proves that

$$p_M(x_B) = p_M(x_{\bar{B}}).$$

On $\mathfrak{a}_M$ we have the usual partial order determined by $P = MN$: in this partial order we have $y \geq y'$ iff $y - y'$ is a non-negative linear combination of elements of the form $p_M(\alpha^\vee)$ for some root $\alpha \in R_N$.

Let $B = B_0, B_1, \dots, B_l = \bar{B}$ be any minimal gallery from B to $\bar{B}$. Then

$$x_B - x_{\bar{B}} = \sum_{i=1}^l (x_{B_{i-1}} - x_{B_i}).$$

Combining the last two displayed equations, we find that

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^l p_M(x_{B_{i-1}} - x_{B_i}),$$

and since each term in the sum on the right hand side of this equation is ≥ 0 in our partial order on $\mathfrak{a}_M$, we conclude that each term is 0. Letting α_i be the unique root that is positive for B_{i-1} and negative for B_i , we have $x_{B_{i-1}} - x_{B_i} = r_i \alpha_i^\vee$ for some non-negative number r_i , and we know that

$$0 = p_M(x_{B_{i-1}} - x_{B_i}) = r_i p_M(\alpha_i^\vee).$$

This yields no information when $\alpha_i \in R_M$, but when $\alpha_i \notin R_M$, then $p_M(\alpha_i^\vee) \neq 0$, and therefore $r_i = 0$, from which it follows that $x_{B_{i-1}} = x_{B_i}$.

We now know that (5) is true for certain adjacent pairs B', B'' , namely those of the form B_{i-1}, B_i for some i . To establish (5) fully we will now check that any adjacent pair B', B'' arises from a suitable minimal gallery from B to $\bar{B}$. (It turns out that we do not need to vary our initial choice of B .) We write $l(B, B')$ for the common length of all minimal galleries joining B and B' (and will use parallel notation for other pairs of Borel subgroups). Then $l(B, B')$ and $l(B, B'')$ differ by 1, since B', B'' are adjacent. Exchanging B' with B'' if necessary, we can find a positive integer i such that $l(B, B') = i - 1$ and $l(B, B'') = i$. Note

that $l(B'', \bar{B}) = l - i$, where l is the number of positive roots in the root system of G . Splicing together any two minimal galleries $B = B_0, \dots, B_{i-1} = B'$ and $B'' = B_i, B_{i+1}, \dots, B_l = \bar{B}$, we obtain a minimal gallery joining $B, \bar{B}$ and an integer i such that $(B', B'') = (B_{i-1}, B_i)$, as desired. This completes the proof that (4) implies (5).

It remains only to prove that (5) implies (1). Let $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ and suppose that $B_1 \cap M = B_2 \cap M$. Equivalently, we are supposing that no root in M separates B_1 from B_2 . Then by choosing a minimal gallery joining B_1, B_2 , we see from (5) that $x_{B_1} = x_{B_2}$. Thus there exists a unique family $z = (z_{B_M})_{B_M \in \mathcal{B}^M(A)}$ such that $x_B = z_{B \cap M}$.

We just need to check that z is a positive (M, A) -orthogonal set. So suppose that $B'_M, B''_M \in \mathcal{B}^M(A)$ are adjacent, and let α be the unique root in M which is positive for B'_M and negative for B''_M . Choose $B', B'' \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $B' \cap M = B'_M$ and $B'' \cap M = B''_M$, and then choose a minimal gallery from B' to B'' . For exactly one adjacent pair in this gallery the separating root will be α , and for the other adjacent pairs the separating root will not be a root of M . From (5) (and using that x is a positive (G, A) -orthogonal set) we conclude that

$$x_{B'} - x_{B''} = 0 + \dots + 0 + r\alpha^\vee + 0 + \dots + 0$$

for some non-negative number r . In other words $z_{B'_M} - z_{B''_M} = r\alpha^\vee$, so that z is indeed a positive (M, A) -orthogonal set. $\square$

Remark 5.2. The lemma we just proved has some obvious variants. First, a similar result applies to negative (G, A) -orthogonal sets x , as one sees by applying the lemma to the positive (G, A) -orthogonal set $-x$. Second, there is no harm in allowing our (G, A) -orthogonal sets to take values in an affine space under $\mathfrak{a}$ (for example the apartment of A in the enlarged building for G is such an affine space and cannot be identified with $\mathfrak{a}$ without choosing a basepoint in that apartment).

5.4. Bruhat-Tits building $\mathcal{BT}_G$. We are going to work with the enlarged Bruhat-Tits building $\mathcal{BT}_G$ of G , though we are going to drop the word “enlarged.” The building for G is the cartesian product of the buildings of A_G and G/A_G , the building for A_G being the affine space underlying the real vector space $X_*(A_G)_{\mathbb{R}} \simeq \mathfrak{a}_G$. The building for G is canonical up to isomorphism, but not up to *unique* isomorphism, as $\mathfrak{a}_G$ acts on $\mathcal{BT}_G$, preserving all its natural structures (see [BT84, 4.2.16] for a discussion of the precise sense in which $\mathfrak{a}_G$ is the automorphism group of the building).

The apartment of A in $\mathcal{BT}_G$ serves as a building for A , and thus we will denote it by $\mathcal{BT}_A$. More generally (see [BT84, 5.1.3]) for any Levi subgroup M of G containing A , the subset $M(F)\mathcal{BT}_A$ of $\mathcal{BT}_G$ serves as a building $\mathcal{BT}_M$ for M .

5.5. Retractions. Consider a Levi subgroup M containing A as well as a parabolic subgroup $P = MN$ with Levi component M . We claim that there is an $M(F)$ -equivariant retraction $r_P : \mathcal{BT}_G \rightarrow \mathcal{BT}_M$, characterized by the following two properties:

- (1) the restriction of r_P to $\mathcal{BT}_M$ is the identity map on $\mathcal{BT}_M$, and
- (2) $r_P(nx) = r_P(x)$ for all $n \in N(F)$, $x \in \mathcal{BT}_G$,

the point being that the composed map

$$(5.1) \quad \mathcal{BT}_M \hookrightarrow \mathcal{BT}_G \twoheadrightarrow N(F) \backslash \mathcal{BT}_G$$

is a bijection. When $M = A$, so that P is a Borel subgroup of G , the retraction r_P was introduced by Bruhat-Tits in [BT72, 2.9].

We now check that the existence of retractions r_B with respect to Borel subgroups implies the existence of r_P . For this we choose a Borel subgroup $B = AU$ such that $A \subset B \subset P$, and we denote by $B_M = AU_M$ the Borel subgroup of M obtained as the intersection of B with M ; of course $U = NU_M$.

To see that (5.1) is surjective, we write $x \in \mathcal{BT}_G$ as $x = u\lambda$ for $u \in U(F)$ and $\lambda \in \mathcal{BT}_A$. Decomposing u as nu_M with $n \in N(F)$ and $u_M \in U_M(F)$, we see that $x = n(u_M\lambda) \in N(F)\mathcal{BT}_M$.

To see that (5.1) is injective, we consider $x, x' \in \mathcal{BT}_M$, and we assume that there exists $n \in N(F)$ such that $x' = nx$. We must show that $x' = x$. Using the surjectivity of (5.1) for (M, B_M) , we may write $x = u_M\lambda$, $x' = u'_M\lambda'$ for $u_M, u'_M \in U_M(F)$, $\lambda, \lambda' \in \mathcal{BT}_A$. Therefore $u'_M\lambda' = nu_M\lambda$, and the injectivity of (5.1) for (G, B) implies that $\lambda' = \lambda$ and that $u'_M{}^{-1}nu_M$ lies in the stabilizer of λ in $U(F)$, namely $U(F) \cap K_\lambda$. Here we have written K_λ for the parahoric subgroup of $G(F)$ determined by λ , and we used that $U(F)$ essentially lives in the simply connected cover of the derived group, where parahoric subgroups are actually stabilizers of points in the building. Now we are going to use the decomposition

$$U(F) \cap K_\lambda = (N(F) \cap K_\lambda)(U_M(F) \cap K_\lambda),$$

a consequence of the fact that Bruhat and Tits define the $\mathfrak{o}$ -form G_λ (the one such that $K_\lambda = G_\lambda(\mathfrak{o})$) in such a way as to be compatible with the factorization of U as a product of root groups (see 3.8.1, 3.8.3 and 4.6.2 in [BT84]). Applying this fact to $u'_M{}^{-1}nu_M$, we find that $(u'_M)^{-1}u_M \in K_\lambda$, and hence that $x' = x$.

5.6. Obvious compatibilities among retractions. Given a Borel subgroup B of G containing A , we obtain a Borel subgroup $B \cap M$ of M containing A . We then have the following compatibility between the retraction r_B and its analog $r_{B \cap M}^M : \mathcal{BT}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{BT}_A$ for M :

$$(5.2) \quad r_B(x) = r_{B \cap M}^M(x)$$

for any x in the subset $\mathcal{BT}_M$ of $\mathcal{BT}_G$.

In the special case that $B \subset P$, the compatibility (5.2) can be generalized to

$$(5.3) \quad r_B = r_{B \cap M}^M \circ r_P.$$

5.7. The (G, A) -orthogonal set in $\mathcal{BT}_A$ determined by an element in $\mathcal{BT}_G$. For fixed $x \in \mathcal{BT}_G$ we may let $B = AU$ vary through the set $\mathcal{B}(A)$ of Borel subgroups of G containing A , thus obtaining a family $x_B := r_B(x)$ of points in $\mathcal{BT}_A$, one for each $B \in \mathcal{B}(A)$ (cmp. [Art76, HC66]). The standard method of reduction to the case of SL_2 shows that (x_B) is a negative (G, A) -orthogonal set in $\mathcal{BT}_A$. That this orthogonal set is negative rather than positive is due to the convention made by Bruhat and Tits, that for any cocharacter μ of A , the element $\mu(\varpi) \in A(F)$ acts on $\mathcal{BT}_A$ by translation by the negative of μ .

Proposition 5.3. *Let $x \in \mathcal{BT}_G$ and let $B = AU$, $B' = AU'$ be Borel subgroups of G containing A . Then $r_B(x) = r_{B'}(x)$ if and only if $x \in ((U(F) \cap U'(F))\mathcal{BT}_A$.*

Proof. ($\Leftarrow$) Say $x = vx_0$ with $v \in U(F) \cap U'(F)$ and $x_0 \in \mathcal{BT}_A$. Then $r_B(x) = x_0 = r_{B'}(x)$.

($\implies$) Consider a minimal gallery $B = B_0, B_1, \dots, B_r = B'$ (of Borel subgroups $B_i = AU_i$) joining B to B' . The proof uses induction on r . When $r = 0$, we just need to note that $U(F)\mathcal{BT}_A = \mathcal{BT}_G$.

For $r > 0$ we first note that the vectors $r_B(x) - r_{B_1}(x)$ and $r_{B_1}(x) - r_{B'}(x)$ are both ≤ 0 with respect to the partial order on $\mathfrak{a}$ obtained from B ; since their sum is zero, they are individually zero, which implies that $r_{B_1}(x) = r_{B'}(x)$. By induction we conclude that x lies in $((U_1(F) \cap U'(F))\mathcal{BT}_A$.

Now $U_1 \cap U' = (U \cap U')U_\alpha$, where U_α is the root subgroup for the unique root α of A in G that is positive for B and negative for B_1 . Thus $x = vu_\alpha x_0$ for some $v \in U(F) \cap U'(F)$, $u_\alpha \in U_\alpha(F)$, $x_0 \in \mathcal{BT}_A$. Put $y = u_\alpha x_0$; we just need to show that $y \in \mathcal{BT}_A$. Let M be the Levi subgroup of G containing A whose root system is $\{\alpha, -\alpha\}$; the derived group of M is then isomorphic to either SL_2 or PGL_2 . In any case $y \in \mathcal{BT}_M$, and the compatibility (5.2) shows that the images of y under the two retractions $\mathcal{BT}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{BT}_A$ are equal. We conclude that $y \in \mathcal{BT}_A$, as desired, by making use of the fact that for any z in the building for SL_2 , the distance between the two retractions of z into the standard apartment is twice the distance from z to that standard apartment. $\square$

Corollary 5.4. *Let $x \in \mathcal{BT}_G$. Then $x \in \mathcal{BT}_M$ if and only if the negative (G, A) -orthogonal set $(r_B(x))_{B \in \mathcal{B}(A)}$ comes from M in the sense of the definition made at the beginning of subsection 5.3.*

Proof. ($\implies$) It is clear from compatibility (5.2) that $(r_B(x))_{B \in \mathcal{B}(A)}$ comes from $(r_{B_M}^M(x))_{B_M \in \mathcal{B}^M(A)}$.

($\impliedby$) Suppose that $(r_B(x))_{B \in \mathcal{B}(A)}$ comes from M . Lemma 5.1 implies that $r_{B_1}(x) = r_{B_2}(x)$ whenever $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}(A)$ are adjacent and separated by a root for G that is not a root for M . Choose a parabolic subgroup $P = MN$ with Levi component M , and consider also the opposite parabolic subgroup $\bar{P} = M\bar{N}$. Choose $B_M = AU_M \in \mathcal{B}^M(A)$. Then there are unique $B = AU, B' = AU' \in \mathcal{B}(A)$ such that $B \subset P, B' \subset \bar{P}$ and $B \cap M = B_M = B' \cap M$. Note that $U \cap U' = U_M$. Since $B \cap M = B' \cap M$, no root of G that separates B and B' is a root of M , and therefore $r_B(x) = r_{B'}(x)$. By the previous proposition we conclude that

$$x \in ((U(F) \cap U'(F))\mathcal{BT}_A = U_M(F)\mathcal{BT}_A = \mathcal{BT}_M.$$

$\square$

Remark 5.5. The previous corollary is a generalization of Lemma 2.1 in [Kot03]. It should be noted that the proof of that lemma in [Kot03] is slightly wrong. The error occurs in the next to last sentence of the proof.

6. COMPATIBILITY OF $\mathfrak{k}_x$ WITH M USUALLY IMPLIES THAT $x \in \mathcal{BT}_M$

We retain the notation of section 5 (see 5.1). In particular G is a split connected reductive group over F with split maximal torus A . In addition we will make use of $\mathfrak{g} = \text{Lie } G$, a Lie algebra over the ground field F .

6.1. Review of parahoric subalgebras of $\mathfrak{g}$. Since A is split, it extends canonically to a smooth group scheme over $\mathfrak{o}$, all of whose geometric fibers are tori, and in this way we obtain a lattice $\mathfrak{a}(\mathfrak{o})$ in $\mathfrak{a}$, namely the Lie algebra of the group scheme A over $\mathfrak{o}$.

To any point $x \in \mathcal{BT}_G$ Bruhat and Tits [BT84] associate a smooth group scheme G_x over $\mathfrak{o}$, and $K_x := G_x(\mathfrak{o})$ is parahoric subgroup of $G(F)$. Actually Bruhat-Tits define a number of variants of G_x ; we will use the one for which the special fiber is connected and which is fabricated using the $\mathfrak{o}$ -form of A we just discussed. The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}_x$ of G_x is a parahoric subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. When it is necessary to indicate which group we are working with, we write $\mathfrak{k}_x^G$ instead of $\mathfrak{k}_x$. When x lies in the apartment of A , the parahoric subalgebra $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is compatible with the root space decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}$, in the sense that it is the direct sum of $\mathfrak{a}(\mathfrak{o})$ and its intersections with the various root spaces in $\mathfrak{g}$, and for any Levi subgroup M containing A we have $\mathfrak{k}_x^M = \mathfrak{k}_x \cap \mathfrak{m}$, where $\mathfrak{m} = \text{Lie } M$, again a Lie algebra over F .

6.2. Notion of compatibility of $\mathfrak{k}_x$ with M . Let M be a Levi subgroup of G containing A , and let A_M be identity component of the center of M . Of course A_M is a split torus, since G is a split group. We then have the canonical direct sum decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{m} \oplus \mathfrak{m}^\perp$, where $\mathfrak{m}^\perp$ is by definition the direct sum of all the non-zero weight spaces for A_M on $\mathfrak{g}$. (When the Killing form is non-degenerate, $\mathfrak{m}^\perp$ is actually the subspace perpendicular to $\mathfrak{m}$ under the Killing form, which may help to explain the notation we chose.) We write $q_M : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{m}$ for the projection map obtained from the direct sum decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{m} \oplus \mathfrak{m}^\perp$; when it is necessary to indicate which group we are working with, we write q_M^G instead of q_M . It is obvious that $q_A = q_A^M \circ q_M$.

For $x \in \mathcal{BT}_G$ we say that $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is *compatible* with M if $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is the direct sum of its intersections with $\mathfrak{m}$ and $\mathfrak{m}^\perp$, or, equivalently, if $\mathfrak{k}_x \cap \mathfrak{m} = q_M(\mathfrak{k}_x)$. Most of the following lemma will be used only in the proof of the next theorem and is of little independent interest. However the fourth part of the lemma will be used again later.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $P = MN$ be a parabolic subgroup with M as Levi component. Let $x \in \mathcal{BT}_G$ and put $y = r_P(x)$. Then the following six statements hold.*

- (1) *If x lies in the subset $\mathcal{BT}_M$ of $\mathcal{BT}_G$, then $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is compatible with M .*
- (2) *$\mathfrak{k}_y^M = q_M(\mathfrak{k}_x \cap \mathfrak{p})$.*
- (3) *$\mathfrak{k}_x \cap \mathfrak{m} \subset \mathfrak{k}_y^M \subset q_M(\mathfrak{k}_x)$. Thus $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is compatible with M if and only if $\mathfrak{k}_x \cap \mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{k}_y^M = q_M(\mathfrak{k}_x)$.*
- (4) *$\mathfrak{k}_x \cap \mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{k}_y^M \cap \mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{a}(\mathfrak{o}) \subset q_A^M(\mathfrak{k}_y^M) \subset q_A(\mathfrak{k}_x)$.*
- (5) *If $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is compatible with A , then $\mathfrak{k}_y^M$ is compatible with A .*
- (6) *If $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is compatible with M and $\mathfrak{k}_y^M$ is compatible with A , then $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is compatible with A .*

Proof. (1) Since the set of x such that $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is compatible with M is stable under the action of $M(F)$ on $\mathcal{BT}_G$, it is enough to show that $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is compatible with M when $x \in \mathcal{BT}_A$, and this follows from the discussion at the end of subsection 6.1.

(2) Say $x = nm\lambda$ for $m \in M(F)$, $n \in N(F)$, $\lambda \in \mathcal{BT}_A$. Then $y = m\lambda$ and both sides of the equality we are trying to prove equal $m\mathfrak{k}_\lambda^M m^{-1}$. Here we used that $\mathfrak{p}$ is stable under the adjoint action of $P(F)$, that the restriction of q_M to $\mathfrak{p}$ is $P(F)$ -equivariant, and that $q_M(\mathfrak{k}_\lambda \cap \mathfrak{p}) = \mathfrak{k}_\lambda^M$, a consequence of the discussion at the end of subsection 6.1.

(3) The first statement follows from (2), and the second follows from the first.

(4) The first inclusion in (4) comes from intersecting the first inclusion in (3) with $\mathfrak{a}$. The last inclusion in (4) comes from applying q_A^M to the second inclusion in

(3). The middle two inclusions in (4) come from applying (3) to (M, A, y) (rather than (G, M, x)).

(5) Assume that $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is compatible with A . Then we have equality of the first and last lattices in (4). Therefore we also have equality of the second and fourth lattices in (4), which is to say that $\mathfrak{k}_y^M$ is compatible with A .

(6) When $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is compatible with M , the reasoning used in the proof of (4) shows that the first and last inclusions in (4) are equalities. When $\mathfrak{k}_y^M$ is compatible with A , the middle two inclusions in (4) are also equalities. Therefore all the lattices in (4) are equal, and $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is compatible with A . $\square$

Theorem 6.2. *Let $x \in \mathcal{BT}_G$. If $x \in \mathcal{BT}_M$, then $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is compatible with M . The converse is true under any of the following three assumptions.*

- (1) *The residue field of $\mathfrak{o}$ is not of characteristic 2.*
- (2) *The center of G is a torus. This is stronger than the assumption that the center of G is connected, since we mean the center in the scheme theoretic sense; for example in characteristic 2 the center of SL_2 is connected, but not a torus.*
- (3) *The point x is special in the sense that its retractions into $\mathcal{BT}_A$ are special points in that apartment. We remind the reader that x is special if and only if every geometric fiber of the group scheme G_x is a connected reductive group.*

Proof. In the previous lemma it was shown that $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is compatible with M when $x \in \mathcal{BT}_M$. Our real task is to prove the converse. In the first part of this proof we will treat the special case in which $M = A$, and then we will use this special case to handle the general one.

Thus, for the moment we assume that $M = A$. First we examine the case in which G has semisimple rank 1, so that G is isomorphic to the direct product of a split torus and one of the three groups SL_2 , GL_2 , and PGL_2 . It is harmless to discard the torus factor, and thus we may as well assume that G is one of the three groups just mentioned, and that M is the torus of diagonal matrices in G . We will make use of the upper triangular Borel subgroup $P = MU$ and the corresponding positive root α .

We write x as $x = u\lambda$ for $\lambda \in \mathcal{BT}_M$ and

$$u = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & t \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \in U(F).$$

We are going to work out concretely what it means for $\mathfrak{k}_x$ to be compatible with M .

The root vectors

$$X_+ := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad X_- := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

form a basis for $\mathfrak{m}^\perp$. There are unique integers a, b such that

$$\mathfrak{k}_\lambda = \mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{o}) \oplus \varpi^a \mathfrak{o} X_+ \oplus \varpi^b \mathfrak{o} X_-,$$

and moreover the sum $a + b$ is 0 (resp., 1) if x is special (resp., not special).

From the third part of Lemma 6.1 it follows that $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is compatible with M if and only if

$$(6.1) \quad \mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{o}) \subset \mathfrak{k}_x$$

and

$$(6.2) \quad q_M(\mathfrak{k}_x) \subset \mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{o}).$$

Since $\mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{o}) \subset \mathfrak{k}_\lambda$, (6.1) is equivalent to $(\text{Ad}(u^{-1}) - 1)\mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{o}) \subset \mathfrak{k}_\lambda$, which boils down to $\text{ad}(-tX_+)\mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{o}) \subset \mathfrak{k}_\lambda$, or, equivalently,

$$(6.3) \quad t\alpha(\mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{o})) \subset \varpi^a \mathfrak{o}.$$

Now

$$\mathfrak{k}_x = u\mathfrak{k}_\lambda u^{-1} = u(\varpi^b \mathfrak{o}X_- \oplus (\mathfrak{k}_\lambda \cap \mathfrak{p}))u^{-1} = \varpi^b \mathfrak{o} \text{Ad}(u)(X_-) \oplus (\mathfrak{k}_x \cap \mathfrak{p})$$

and since $q_M(k_x \cap \mathfrak{p}) = \mathfrak{k}_\lambda^M = \mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{o})$ by the second part of Lemma 6.1, the condition (6.2) is equivalent to

$$q_M(\varpi^b \text{Ad}(u)(X_-)) \in \mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{o}),$$

and this boils down to the condition

$$(6.4) \quad t\varpi^b H_\alpha \in \mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{o}),$$

where H_α is the coroot for α , viewed as an element of the Lie algebra of $A = M$.

Now we can complete the proof in the special case under consideration. Suppose that $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is compatible with M . If G is GL_2 or PGL_2 , or if the residual characteristic is not 2, then $\alpha(\mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{o})) = \mathfrak{o}$, and (6.3) says that $t \in \varpi^a \mathfrak{o}$. Therefore u fixes λ , so that $x = u\lambda = \lambda \in \mathcal{BT}_M$.

When G is SL_2 , then (6.3) says only that $2t \in \varpi^a \mathfrak{o}$, and when the residual characteristic is 2, this is not enough to conclude that u fixes λ . However, if x is special, then $b = -a$, so that (6.4) becomes the statement that $t \in \varpi^a \mathfrak{o}$ (since for SL_2 we have $\mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{o}) = \mathfrak{o}H_\alpha$), and again we conclude that $x = u\lambda = \lambda \in \mathcal{BT}_M$.

The next step is to prove the theorem for general G , but with M still equal to A . So we assume that $x \in \mathcal{BT}_G$ is such that $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is compatible with A , and we must prove that $x \in \mathcal{BT}_A$. By Corollary 5.4 it is enough to check that $r_B(x) = r_{B'}(x)$ whenever B, B' are adjacent Borel subgroups containing A . Let α be the unique root of A that is positive for B and negative for B' , let M_α be the Levi subgroup of semisimple rank 1 containing A whose roots are $\{\alpha, -\alpha\}$, and let $P = M_\alpha N$ be the unique parabolic subgroup with Levi component M_α that contains both B and B' . Put $y = r_P(x)$.

From the fifth part of Lemma 6.1 it follows that $\mathfrak{k}_y^{M_\alpha}$ is compatible with A . If the center of G is a torus, the same is true for any Levi subgroup of G , and in particular this is so for M_α . Also, if x is special, so too is y . Therefore, from the semisimple rank 1 case that has already been treated, we conclude that $y \in \mathcal{BT}_A$ and hence that

$$r_B(x) = r_{B \cap M_\alpha}(y) = y = r_{B' \cap M_\alpha}(y) = r_{B'}(x),$$

as desired.

Now consider the general case. We are given $x \in \mathcal{BT}_G$ such that $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is compatible with M , and we must show that $x \in \mathcal{BT}_M$. Choose a parabolic subgroup $P = MN$ with Levi component M , and put $y = r_P(x) \in \mathcal{BT}_M$. Since it is harmless to multiply x on the left by any element of $M(F)$, we may as well assume that $y \in \mathcal{BT}_A$. To prove the theorem it suffices to show that $x \in \mathcal{BT}_A$.

Thus, by what we have already proved, it is enough to show that $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is compatible with A , and this follows from the sixth part of Lemma 6.1 because $\mathfrak{k}_x$ is compatible with M and $\mathfrak{k}_y^M$ is compatible with A (since $y \in \mathcal{BT}_A$). $\square$

7. REVIEW OF ROOT VALUATION FUNCTIONS AND STRATA

7.1. Notation. For the rest of this paper we work with $F = \mathbb{C}((\epsilon))$, $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{C}[[\epsilon]]$. In addition we consider a split connected reductive group G over $\mathbb{C}$ and a split maximal torus A in G . Associated to A we have its set R of roots, its Weyl group W and its Lie algebra $\mathfrak{a}$. We remind the reader that it was only in section 5 that we used $\mathfrak{a}$ to denote $X_*(A) \otimes \mathbb{R}$. Moreover we have the root space decomposition

$$(7.1) \quad \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{a} \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in R} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \right),$$

where $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ is the root space corresponding to $\alpha \in R$. Finally, for $\alpha \in R$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ we will often use P_α^n as a convenient abbreviation for $\epsilon^n \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(\mathcal{O})$.

7.2. Root valuation functions. Let $u \in \mathfrak{a}(F)$ and assume that u is regular in $\mathfrak{g}(F)$. Then, as in [GKM], we obtain from u the function $r_u : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ defined by $r_u(\alpha) := \text{val } \alpha(u)$.

Given any function $r : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, we denote by $\mathfrak{a}(F)_r$ the subset of $\mathfrak{a}(F)$ consisting of all regular elements u for which $r_u = r$. In Proposition 3.4.1 of [GKM] it was shown that $\mathfrak{a}(F)_r$ is nonempty if and only if r satisfies the following condition on the subsets $R_m := \{\alpha \in R : r(\alpha) \geq m\}$ of R : for every $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ the subset R_m is $\mathbb{Q}$ -closed (equivalently, is the root system of a Levi subgroup of G containing A). In this paper we will refer to functions r satisfying this condition as *root valuation functions*.

Now let u be a regular semisimple element of $\mathfrak{g}(F)$. We say that u is *split* if its centralizer in G is a split maximal F -torus in G . Any split regular semisimple $u \in \mathfrak{g}(F)$ is $G(F)$ -conjugate to an element $u' \in \mathfrak{a}(F)$, well-defined up to the action of W on $\mathfrak{a}(F)$. The root valuation function $r_{u'}$ is then well-defined up to the action of W . Turning this around, as in [GKM], we consider a root valuation function $r : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ and then denote by $\mathfrak{g}(F)_r$ the subset of $\mathfrak{g}(F)$ consisting of split regular semisimple elements u for which the root valuation function $r_{u'}$ lies in the W -orbit of r . The subset $\mathfrak{g}(F)_r$ is referred to as the *root valuation stratum* in $\mathfrak{g}(F)$ associated to r .

8. GENERALIZED AFFINE SPRINGER FIBERS ADAPTED TO A GIVEN ROOT VALUATION FUNCTION

As before, for any x in the building of the F -group G_F , we can consider the corresponding parahoric subgroup K_x and its Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}_x$.

8.1. Goal. Our goal in this section is to investigate a new kind of affine Springer theory that is adapted to a given root valuation stratum in $\mathfrak{g}(F)$. Let us then fix a root valuation function $r : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ and a point x in the apartment of A . Using r, x we will construct an ind-scheme $Y_{r,x}$ and a morphism $Y_{r,x} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}(F)$, generalizing affine Springer theory for the partial affine flag manifold $G(F)/K_x$. Over the particular root valuation stratum $\mathfrak{g}(F)_r$ the fibers of this morphism are 0-dimensional and have a very simple description, as we will see in Theorem 8.1.

8.2. Definition of $\tilde{r}$. We will be making use of the same concepts that arose in our discussion (see section 4) of the linear Hodge-Newton decomposition for linear transformations. The linear transformations of interest are the ones of the form $\text{ad}(u)$ for $u \in \mathfrak{g}(F)$. Let d denote the dimension of $\mathfrak{g}$. Then the Newton point for

any linear transformation $\mathfrak{g}(F) \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}(F)$ lies in $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}_+^d$, while the Hodge point of such a linear transformation with respect to some lattice in $\mathfrak{g}(F)$ lies in the intersection of $(\mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\})^d$ with $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}_+^d$.

We now use r to produce an element $\tilde{r} \in (\mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\})^d \cap \tilde{\mathbb{Q}}_+^d$. One way to give the definition is to say that $\tilde{r}$ is the Newton point of $\text{ad}(u)$ for any u in the root valuation stratum $\mathfrak{g}(F)_r$. More concretely, $\tilde{r}$ is obtained by forming the d -tuple whose first $|R|$ entries are the integers $r(\alpha)$, listed in non-decreasing order, and whose last $d - |R| = \dim A$ entries are all ∞ .

8.3. Definition of $Y_{r,x} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}(F)$. As we just said, in the situation we are in, we may consider the Hodge point $\mu(\text{ad}(u), \Lambda) \in \tilde{\mathbb{Q}}_+^d$ for any lattice Λ in $\mathfrak{g}(F)$. The lattices we care about are the ones obtained as $\mathfrak{k}_{gx} = g\mathfrak{k}_x g^{-1}$ for some $g \in G(F)/K_x$, and we define $Y_{r,x}$ to be the set of pairs $(u, g) \in \mathfrak{g}(F) \times (G(F)/K_x)$ satisfying the condition that

$$\mu(\text{ad}(u), \mathfrak{k}_{gx}) \leq \tilde{r}.$$

We also consider the map $\pi_{r,x} : Y_{r,x} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}(F)$ defined by $(u, g) \mapsto u$.

The fibers of $\pi_{r,x}$ are generalizations of affine Springer fibers; indeed, usual affine Springer theory is recovered by taking r to be identically 0. It follows from Theorem 4.2(1) that if $(u, g) \in Y_{r,x}$, then

$$(8.1) \quad \nu(\text{ad}(u)) \leq \mu(\text{ad}(u), \mathfrak{k}_{gx}) \leq \tilde{r}.$$

In particular, the fiber of $\pi_{r,x}$ over $u \in \mathfrak{g}(F)$ is empty unless $\nu(\text{ad}(u)) \leq \tilde{r}$.

8.4. Fibers of $\pi_{r,x}$ over certain strata $\mathfrak{a}(F)_{r'}$. Let $r' : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be another root valuation function. We say that r' is *weakly equivalent* to r if $\tilde{r}' = \tilde{r}$. Of course if r' is of the form wr for some $w \in W$, then r' is weakly equivalent to r .

Theorem 8.1. *Suppose that r' is a root valuation function that is weakly equivalent to r , and let $u \in \mathfrak{a}(F)_{r'}$. Then the fiber of $\pi_{x,r}$ over u consists of the set of $g \in G(F)/K_x$ such that gx lies in the apartment of A . For example, when x lies in the interior of an alcove, so that K_x is an Iwahori subgroup, this fiber can be identified with the extended affine Weyl group $\tilde{W}$.*

Proof. It is obvious that when gx lies in the apartment of A , the Hodge point $\mu(\text{ad}(u), \mathfrak{k}_{gx})$ is $\tilde{r}$, so such points g do lie in the fiber over u .

Conversely, suppose that g is a point in the fiber over u . Since $\nu(\text{ad } u) = \tilde{r}$, we conclude from (8.1) that $\nu(\text{ad}(u)) = \mu(\text{ad}(u), \mathfrak{k}_{gx})$. It then follows from Theorem 4.2(2), applied to the subspaces $W = \mathfrak{a}(F)$ and $U = \mathfrak{a}^\perp(F)$, that $\mathfrak{k}_{gx}$ is compatible with A . From Theorem 6.2 we see that gx lies in the apartment of A , as desired. $\square$

9. ADMISSIBLE PROALGEBRAIC SUBGROUPS OF $G(F)$

9.1. Basic definitions. As before, for any point x in the building of $G(F)$ we denote by G_x the group scheme over $\mathcal{O}$ that Bruhat-Tits associate to x . As usual $K_x := G_x(\mathcal{O})$ is a parahoric subgroup of $G(F)$, and the Lie algebra of G_x is a parahoric subalgebra $\mathfrak{k}_x$ of $\mathfrak{g}(F)$. For any nonnegative integer n we denote by $K_{x,n}$ the kernel of $G_x(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow G_x(\mathcal{O}/P^n)$. Then the equality

$$K_x = \varprojlim_n K_x/K_{x,n}$$

exhibits K_x as a proalgebraic group over $\mathbb{C}$. Let y be another point in the building. Then $K_x \cap K_y$ is a proalgebraic subgroup of both K_x and K_y .

Let K be a subgroup of $G(F)$. We say that K is an *admissible proalgebraic subgroup* of $G(F)$ if the following two conditions hold:

- (1) there exists x in the building and $m \geq 0$ such that

$$(9.1) \quad K_x \supset K \supset K_{x,m},$$

- (2) for one (equivalently, every) x, m satisfying (9.1), $K/K_{x,m}$ is a closed algebraic subgroup of $K_x/K_{x,m}$.

The proalgebraic structures on K inherited from the various K_x containing K all agree with each other, so that K becomes a proalgebraic group in a canonical way.

9.2. Maximal tori in admissible proalgebraic subgroups. An admissible proalgebraic subgroup K of $G(F)$ is a rather special kind of proalgebraic group, in that its quotient by its pronilpotent radical is a reductive algebraic group. Therefore K has maximal $\mathbb{C}$ -tori, and any two such are conjugate under K ; here one needs to bear in mind that if

$$1 \rightarrow U \rightarrow H \rightarrow H/U \rightarrow 1$$

is a short exact sequence of linear algebraic groups, with U unipotent, then any two maximal tori in H having the same image in H/U are conjugate under U (not just under H). To prove this last fact one can apply the fourth part of Theorem (10.6) in [Bor] to the connected solvable group obtained as the preimage in H of the common image in H/U of the two maximal tori in question.

9.3. Review of some results of Bruhat-Tits. We begin by reviewing Bruhat-Tits' notion of concave function on the root system R .

Definition 9.1. A function $f : R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *concave* if

- (1) $f(\alpha) + f(\beta) \geq f(\alpha + \beta)$ whenever $\alpha, \beta \in R$ are such that $\alpha + \beta \in R$, and
- (2) $f(\alpha) + f(-\alpha) \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in R$.

The next proposition is a less general version of Bruhat-Tits' [BT72] Proposition (6.4.6).

Proposition 9.2. *Let f be a concave function on the root system R . Then there exists x in the apartment $X_*(A) \otimes \mathbb{R}$ of A such that*

$$\alpha(x) \leq f(\alpha)$$

for all $\alpha \in R$.

Before stating the next result, we remind the reader that for $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ the lattice P_α^m in $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(F)$ was defined in subsection 7.1.

Corollary 9.3. *Let $\mathfrak{k}$ be a lattice in $\mathfrak{g}(F)$ of the form*

$$\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O}) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in R} P_\alpha^{k(\alpha)} \right)$$

for some function $k : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. Then $\mathfrak{k}$ is a subalgebra of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}(F)$ if and only if k is a concave function, and in this case there exists a point x in the apartment of A such that $\mathfrak{k}$ is contained in the parahoric subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}(F)$ determined by x .

Proof. We may as well assume that G is semisimple. An easy calculation shows that $\mathfrak{k}$ is closed under bracket if and only if k is a concave function, and in this case the proposition above says that there exists x in the apartment of A such that $\alpha(x) \leq k(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in R$, so that $\mathfrak{k}$ is contained in the parahoric subalgebra

$$\mathfrak{k}_x = \mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O}) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in R} P_{\alpha}^{\lceil \alpha(x) \rceil} \right).$$

□

Remark 9.4. We retain the notation in the corollary. When k is concave, Bruhat-Tits (see Thm. 4.5.4 and sections 4.6.4 and 4.6.8 of [BT84]) construct a smooth affine group scheme G_k over $\mathcal{O}$ with generic fiber G_F and connected special fiber, having the property that $\mathrm{Lie} G_k = \mathfrak{k}$; thus $G_k(\mathcal{O})$ is a connected admissible proalgebraic subgroup of $G(F)$ having Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}$.

9.4. Recognizing maximal tori in the presence of a suitable torus action.

We now interrupt our discussion in order to prove the following proposition, which will be applied in the next subsection. In it we may as well work over any algebraically closed field.

Proposition 9.5. *Let H be a linear algebraic group, equipped with the action of a torus A , which we use to form the semidirect product $A \ltimes H$. Let T be a torus in H satisfying the following two conditions:*

- (1) *A centralizes T , so that $A \times T$ is a subgroup of $A \ltimes H$, and*
- (2) *The identity component of the group $H^{A \times T}$ of fixed points of the conjugation action of $A \times T$ on H is equal to T .*

Then T is a maximal torus in H .

Proof. The identity component of the centralizer in $A \ltimes H$ of $A \times T$ is equal to $A \times T$, and therefore $A \times T$ is a maximal torus in $A \ltimes H$. Let S be any torus in H that contains T ; we must show that $S = T$. Now some conjugate in $A \ltimes H$ of the maximal torus $A \times T$ must contain S . Since A centralizes T , any such conjugate has the form $h^{-1}(A \times T)h$ for some $h \in H$. Then $hSh^{-1} \subset T$. Therefore S and T have the same dimension, and since S contains T , this shows that $S = T$, as desired. □

9.5. An application. Now we return to our usual setup. We are going to use the proposition we just proved in order to recognize maximal tori in certain proalgebraic subgroups of $G(F)$ that will arise later when we study root valuation lattices in $\mathfrak{g}(F)$.

We begin by recalling the usual action of $\mathbb{C}^\times$ on the field F (by field automorphisms). For this action an element $t \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ acts on ϵ by multiplication by t , hence acts on the Laurent power series $\sum_i a_i \epsilon^i$ by sending it to $\sum_i a_i t^i \epsilon^i$. The fixed field of this action is of course $\mathbb{C}$. This action then induces actions of $\mathbb{C}^\times$ on $G(F)$ (having fixed points $G(\mathbb{C})$) and on $\mathfrak{g}(F)$ (having fixed points $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{C})$).

We will be interested in $\mathbb{C}^\times$ -stable sublattices in $\mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O})$. Any such lattice is obtained in the following way. Let $V_0 \subset V_1 \subset V_2 \subset \dots$ be an increasing chain of linear subspaces of $\mathfrak{a}(\mathbb{C})$ such that $V_i = \mathfrak{a}(\mathbb{C})$ for $i \gg 0$. Then

$$\left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} v_i \epsilon^i : v_i \in V_i \quad \forall i \geq 0 \right\}$$

is a $\mathbb{C}^\times$ -stable lattice in $\mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O})$.

Now $\mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O})$ is the Lie algebra of the proalgebraic group $A(\mathcal{O})$. Again consider a lattice in $\mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O})$. We say that it is algebraic if it arises as the Lie algebra of a proalgebraic subgroup of $A(\mathcal{O})$ containing $\ker[A(\mathcal{O}) \twoheadrightarrow A(\mathcal{O}/P^N)]$ for some sufficiently large N . The commutative proalgebraic group $A(\mathcal{O})$ is the cartesian product of the torus $A(\mathbb{C})$ and the prounipotent commutative algebraic group $\ker[A(\mathcal{O}) \twoheadrightarrow A(\mathbb{C})]$. Thus any proalgebraic subgroup of $A(\mathcal{O})$ of the type we are considering is the cartesian product of $S(\mathbb{C})$, S being some subtorus of A , and a proalgebraic subgroup of $\ker[A(\mathcal{O}) \twoheadrightarrow A(\mathbb{C})]$. The corresponding algebraic lattice in $\mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O})$ is then the direct sum of $\mathfrak{s}(\mathbb{C})$ and some lattice in $\epsilon\mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O})$.

Now consider an $\mathcal{O}$ -subalgebra Λ in $\mathfrak{g}(F)$ of the form

$$\Lambda = \Lambda_A \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in R} P_\alpha^{\lambda(\alpha)} \right)$$

for some family of integers $\lambda(\alpha)$ ($\alpha \in R$) and a $\mathbb{C}^\times$ -stable algebraic lattice Λ_A in $\mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O})$. Thus there is a subtorus $S \subset A$ and an increasing chain $\mathfrak{s}(\mathbb{C}) = V_0 \subset V_1 \subset V_2 \subset \dots$ of linear subspaces of $\mathfrak{a}(\mathbb{C})$ such $V_i = \mathfrak{a}(\mathbb{C})$ for $i \gg 0$ and

$$\Lambda_A = \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} v_i \epsilon^i : v_i \in V_i \quad \forall i \geq 0 \right\}.$$

Since Λ is normalized by $A(\mathcal{O})$, the lattice

$$\Lambda^\sharp = \mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O}) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in R} P_\alpha^{\lambda(\alpha)} \right)$$

is also an $\mathcal{O}$ -subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}(F)$. It follows that λ is a concave function on R , and hence that, by the result of Bruhat-Tits we just reviewed, there exists a point x in the apartment of A such that $\Lambda^\sharp$ is contained in the parahoric subalgebra $\mathfrak{k}_x$ associated to x . Thus we also have $\Lambda \subset \mathfrak{k}_x$. Since Λ_A is an algebraic subalgebra of $\mathfrak{k}_x$, and each $P_\alpha^{\lambda(\alpha)}$ arises in an obvious way as the Lie algebra of a proalgebraic subgroup of K_x , we conclude from Corollary (7.7) of [Bor] that Λ is an algebraic subalgebra of $\mathfrak{k}_x$, in the sense that there is a connected admissible proalgebraic subgroup $\tilde{\Lambda}$ of the parahoric subgroup K_x such that Lie algebra of $\tilde{\Lambda}$ is Λ .

We are now going to use Proposition 9.5 to show that $S(\mathbb{C})$ is a maximal torus of $\tilde{\Lambda}$. Indeed, by that proposition we just need to find a torus acting on $\tilde{\Lambda}$ such that the induced action on Λ has fixed points $\mathfrak{s}(\mathbb{C})$. The right torus to use is $A(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathbb{C}^\times$, with $A(\mathbb{C})$ acting by conjugation and $\mathbb{C}^\times$ acting as described above. Since Λ is $\mathbb{C}^\times$ -stable, so too is $\tilde{\Lambda}$. The fixed points of $A(\mathbb{C})$ on Λ are Λ_A , and the fixed points of $\mathbb{C}^\times$ on Λ are $\Lambda \cap \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{C})$; therefore the fixed points of $A(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathbb{C}^\times$ on Λ are $\Lambda_A \cap \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{C}) = \mathfrak{s}(\mathbb{C})$, as desired.

10. TOPOLOGICAL JORDAN DECOMPOSITION

10.1. Review of the topological Jordan decomposition. The reader who is already familiar with the topological Jordan decomposition should skip this subsection.

Let K be an admissible proalgebraic subgroup of $G(F)$. Choose x, m such that (9.1) holds. The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}$ of K is then a Lie $\mathbb{C}$ -subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}(F)$ such that

$\mathfrak{k}_x \supset \mathfrak{k} \supset \epsilon^m \mathfrak{k}_x$. Moreover we have

$$\mathfrak{k} = \varprojlim_{n \geq m} \text{Lie}(K/K_{x,n}) = \varprojlim_{n \geq m} \mathfrak{k} / \epsilon^n \mathfrak{k}_x.$$

Say that $u \in \mathfrak{k}$ is $\mathbb{C}$ -semisimple (respectively, topologically nilpotent) if its image in the Lie algebra of $K/K_{x,n}$ is semisimple (respectively, nilpotent) for all $n \geq m$. For $u \in \mathfrak{k}$ the Jordan decompositions of the images of u in $\text{Lie}(K/K_{x,n})$ are compatible with each other as n varies, so that there exist unique $u_s, u_n \in \mathfrak{k}$ such that $u = u_s + u_n$, $[u_s, u_n] = 0$, u_s is $\mathbb{C}$ -semisimple, and u_n is topologically nilpotent. This is customarily called the topological Jordan decomposition of u and is independent of the choice of x, m for which (9.1) holds.

Suppose that K' is an admissible proalgebraic subgroup containing K . Then the topological Jordan decompositions of $u \in \mathfrak{k} \subset \mathfrak{k}'$ coincide. In particular the topological Jordan decomposition of $u \in \mathfrak{k}$ can be calculated inside the Lie algebra of any parahoric subgroup containing K .

An element $u \in \mathfrak{g}(F)$ is said to be *integral* if it is contained in some parahoric subalgebra $\mathfrak{k}_x$. Any integral element $u \in \mathfrak{g}(F)$ has a topological Jordan decomposition $u = u_s + u_n$, independent of the choice of parahoric subalgebra containing it.

10.2. Relation between root valuations and the topological Jordan decomposition. Let $u \in \mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O})$ and assume that u is regular, so that $\alpha(u) \neq 0$ for all $\alpha \in R$. We then have the root valuation function $r : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ determined by u , namely $r(\alpha) := \text{val } \alpha(u)$. Now u is integral and its $\mathbb{C}$ -semisimple part u_s is simply the image of u under $\mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}(\mathbb{C}) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O})$. It follows that

$$\{\alpha \in R : r(\alpha) \geq 1\} = \{\alpha \in R : \alpha(u_s) = 0\}.$$

More generally, let u be a regular semisimple element of $\mathfrak{g}(F)$ that is $G(F)$ -conjugate to some element in $\mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O})$. Choosing $g \in G(F)$ such that $u_1 = gug^{-1}$ lies in $\mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O})$, we obtain the root valuation function $r(\alpha) = \text{val } \alpha(u_1)$ for u_1 . If we make a different choice of g , we will change u_1 and r by an element in the Weyl group, but the cardinality of $\{\alpha \in R : r(\alpha) \geq 1\}$ will be unchanged.

Since u is integral, we may consider its $\mathbb{C}$ -semisimple part u_s . There exists $h \in G(F)$ such that $v := hu_s h^{-1}$ lies in $\mathfrak{a}(\mathbb{C})$. Of course we can take $h = g$, we are not obliged to. Again v is only well-defined up to the action of the Weyl group, but the cardinality of $\{\alpha \in R : \alpha(v) = 0\}$ is independent of the choice of h . Moreover, taking $h = g$, we see that

$$(10.1) \quad |\{\alpha \in R : r(\alpha) \geq 1\}| = |\{\alpha \in R : \alpha(v) = 0\}|,$$

a simple observation that will play an important role in the proof of the Key Lemma 12.2 needed to prove the Conjugation Theorem 12.1 for root valuation lattices.

11. DEFINITION AND FIRST PROPERTIES OF ROOT VALUATION LATTICES

We now assume that G is semisimple, not just reductive. Throughout this section we fix some root valuation function $r : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. We have already discussed the subset $\mathfrak{a}(F)_r$. We will also make use of the lattice

$$(11.1) \quad \mathfrak{a}(F)_{\geq r} := \{u \in \mathfrak{a}(F) : \text{val } \alpha(u) \geq r(\alpha) \quad \forall \alpha \in R\}$$

in $\mathfrak{a}(F)$ obtained as the closure of $\mathfrak{a}(F)_r$.

11.1. $A(\mathcal{O})$ -stable lattices in $\mathfrak{g}(F)$. A lattice Λ in $\mathfrak{g}(F)$ is $A(\mathcal{O})$ -stable for the adjoint action of $A(\mathcal{O})$ on $\mathfrak{g}(F)$ if and only if it is of the form

$$(11.2) \quad \Lambda_A \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in R} P_{\alpha}^{\lambda(\alpha)} \right)$$

for some lattice Λ_A in $\mathfrak{a}(F)$ and integers $\lambda(\alpha)$.

11.2. Root valuation lattices. We are interested in $A(\mathcal{O})$ -stable lattices in $\mathfrak{g}(F)$ adapted to studying the root valuation stratum $\mathfrak{g}(F)_r$. Consider then a function $\lambda : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. To r, λ we associate the $A(\mathcal{O})$ -stable lattice Λ defined by

$$(11.3) \quad \Lambda := \mathfrak{a}(F)_{\geq r} \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in R} P_{\alpha}^{\lambda(\alpha)} \right).$$

When we wish to remember the particular r, λ used to form this lattice we write $\Lambda_{r, \lambda}$ rather than Λ .

Now we seek a condition on λ guaranteeing that a generic element in Λ is conjugate to an element in $\mathfrak{a}(F)_r$. To this end we consider the admissible proalgebraic subgroup $\{g \in G(F) : g\Lambda g^{-1} = \Lambda\}$, whose identity component we denote by $K = K_{r, \lambda}$. Note that K contains $A(\mathcal{O})$. We write $\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{k}_{r, \lambda}$ for the Lie algebra of K . By construction the adjoint action of K preserves Λ , so we may consider the morphism

$$(11.4) \quad \varphi = \varphi_{r, \lambda} : K \times \mathfrak{a}(F)_r \rightarrow \Lambda$$

sending (x, u) to xux^{-1} . We say that Λ is a *root valuation lattice* if the morphism φ is a submersion. When Λ is a root valuation lattice, the image Λ_0 of φ is an open Zariski dense subset of Λ , and every element of Λ_0 is K -conjugate to an element of $\mathfrak{a}(F)_r$.

As a basic example, for the root valuation function taking the value 0 on all roots, $\mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{O})$ is a root valuation lattice. So too is any parahoric subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}(F)$ containing $\mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O})$. The following proposition determines all root valuation lattices. It makes use of the function $r_m : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ defined by

$$(11.5) \quad r_m(\alpha) := \max\{r(\beta) : \beta \text{ is not strongly orthogonal to } \alpha\}.$$

Note that

$$(11.6) \quad r(\alpha) \leq r_m(\alpha)$$

since α is not strongly orthogonal to itself.

Proposition 11.1. *Let r be a root valuation function and let $\lambda : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be any function. Define a third function $k : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ as the difference $k := \lambda - r$. Then $\Lambda_{r, \lambda}$ is a root valuation lattice if and only if k satisfies the following two conditions:*

- (1) $k(\alpha) + k(-\alpha) \geq r_m(\alpha) - r(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in R$,
- (2) $k(\alpha) + k(\beta) - k(\alpha + \beta) \geq r(\alpha + \beta) - \min\{r(\alpha), r(\beta)\}$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in R$ such that $\alpha + \beta \in R$.

When $\Lambda_{r, \lambda}$ is a root valuation lattice, the Lie algebra of $K_{r, \lambda}$ is given by

$$(11.7) \quad \mathfrak{k}_{r, \lambda} = \mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O}) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in R} P_{\alpha}^{k(\alpha)} \right).$$

Proof. As usual we omit the subscripts r, λ on $\Lambda, K, \mathfrak{k}$. In reading this proof one needs to bear in mind that $r(-\alpha) = r(\alpha)$ for all roots α . Since K contains $A(\mathcal{O})$, the lattice $\mathfrak{k}$ is $A(\mathcal{O})$ -stable, hence of the form

$$(11.8) \quad (\mathfrak{k} \cap \mathfrak{a}(F)) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in R} P_{\alpha}^{l(\alpha)} \right)$$

for some function $l : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. Moreover

$$(11.9) \quad \mathfrak{k} = \{X \in \mathfrak{g}(F) : [X, \Lambda] \subset \Lambda\},$$

from which it follows that

$$(11.10) \quad \mathfrak{k} \cap \mathfrak{a}(F) = \mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O})$$

and that $l(\alpha)$ is the smallest integer satisfying the conditions

- (1) $l(\alpha) + r(\alpha) \geq \lambda(\alpha)$
- (2) $e^{l(\alpha) + \lambda(-\alpha)} H_{\alpha} \in \mathfrak{a}(F)_{\geq r}$
- (3) $l(\alpha) + \lambda(\beta) \geq \lambda(\alpha + \beta)$ for all $\beta \in R$ such that $\alpha + \beta \in R$.

Here H_{α} denotes the coroot $\alpha^{\vee}$, viewed as an element in $\mathfrak{a}$. Expanding out the second condition, and using the equality $\lambda = k + r$, we find that $l(\alpha)$ is the maximum of the (finite) set $S = S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3$ of integers, where

- (1) $S_1 = \{k(\alpha)\}$
- (2) $S_2 = \{r(\beta) - r(\alpha) - k(-\alpha) : \beta \text{ is not orthogonal to } \alpha\}$
- (3) $S_3 = \{k(\alpha + \beta) + r(\alpha + \beta) - k(\beta) - r(\beta) : \beta \text{ satisfies } \alpha + \beta \in R\}$.

It follows from K -equivariance that φ is a submersion if and only if this is so at all points of the form $(1, u)$ with $u \in \mathfrak{a}(F)_r$. Since φ is a submersion at $(1, u)$ if and only if

$$\mathfrak{a}(F)_{\geq r} + [\mathfrak{k}, u] = \Lambda,$$

we conclude that Λ is a root valuation lattice if and only if the functions l and k coincide. In particular the last statement of the proposition is now clear. Furthermore, in view of our description of $l(\alpha)$ as a maximum of a certain set of integers, one of which is $k(\alpha)$, we see that Λ is a root valuation lattice if and only if the following two conditions hold:

- (i) $k(\alpha) + k(-\alpha) \geq r(\beta) - r(\alpha)$ whenever $\alpha, \beta \in R$ are not orthogonal,
- (ii) $k(\alpha) + k(\beta) - k(\alpha + \beta) \geq r(\alpha + \beta) - r(\beta)$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in R$ such that $\alpha + \beta \in R$.

In order to relate (i),(ii) to the somewhat different looking conditions (1),(2) in the statement of the proposition, we are going to prove the following claim: conditions (i) and (ii) together imply that

$$(11.11) \quad k(\alpha) + k(-\alpha) \geq r(\gamma) - r(\alpha)$$

whenever $\alpha, \gamma \in R$ are not strongly orthogonal, a statement which is obviously equivalent to condition (1) of the proposition.

For this we apply (ii) to the roots $\alpha + \beta, -\alpha$ (whose sum is the root β), obtaining the inequality

$$(11.12) \quad k(\alpha + \beta) + k(-\alpha) - k(\beta) \geq r(\beta) - r(\alpha),$$

which, when added to (ii), yields the inequality

$$(11.13) \quad k(\alpha) + k(-\alpha) \geq r(\alpha + \beta) - r(\alpha),$$

valid whenever $\alpha + \beta$ is a root. In other words

$$(11.14) \quad k(\alpha) + k(-\alpha) \geq r(\gamma) - r(\alpha)$$

whenever γ is a root such that the difference of α and γ is a root. This last inequality also holds when the sum of α and γ is a root, as we see from the fact that the left side of the inequality is invariant under replacing α by its negative, as is the term $r(\alpha)$ on the right side. We conclude that

$$(11.15) \quad k(\alpha) + k(-\alpha) \geq r(\gamma) - r(\alpha)$$

for any $\gamma \in R$ such that either $\alpha - \gamma$ or $\alpha + \gamma$ is root. In addition, taking $\alpha = \beta$ in (i), we see that

$$(11.16) \quad k(\alpha) + k(-\alpha) \geq 0.$$

Combining (11.15) and (11.16), we conclude that

$$(11.17) \quad k(\alpha) + k(-\alpha) \geq r(\gamma) - r(\alpha)$$

whenever either $\alpha - \gamma$ or $\alpha + \gamma$ lies in $R \cup \{0\}$, or, in other words, whenever α and γ are not strongly orthogonal.

We have just shown that (i) and (ii) imply condition (1) of the proposition. On the other hand, condition (1) of the proposition trivially implies (i). At this point it remains only to observe that condition (2) of the proposition is equivalent to the conjunction of (ii) and the condition obtained from (ii) by switching α and β . $\square$

Remark 11.2. As we just saw at the end of the proof the previous proposition, we may work with (2) in the less symmetrical form

$$(11.18) \quad k(\alpha) + k(\beta) - k(\alpha + \beta) \geq r(\alpha + \beta) - r(\alpha)$$

whenever it is convenient to do so.

Remark 11.3. If Λ is a root valuation lattice for r , then $\epsilon^n \Lambda$ is a root valuation lattice for the root valuation function $r + n$. Thus it is harmless to work with root valuation functions taking values in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, whenever it is convenient to do so. Now assume that r does take values in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Then the lattice Λ is contained in $\mathfrak{k}$ (as is clear from Proposition 11.1), and therefore Λ is a normal subalgebra of $\mathfrak{k}$ (since $[\mathfrak{k}, \Lambda] \subset \Lambda$). Corollary 9.3 shows that $\mathfrak{k}$ is contained in some parahoric subalgebra and hence the same is true of Λ . Moreover the discussion in subsection 9.5 shows that there is a connected admissible proalgebraic subgroup $\tilde{\Lambda}$ of $G(F)$ having Lie algebra Λ , and that a maximal torus in $\tilde{\Lambda}$ is obtained by taking $S(\mathbb{C})$, where S is the subtorus of A whose Lie algebra consists of all $u \in \mathfrak{a}(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\alpha(u) = 0$ for all $\alpha \in R_1 = \{\alpha \in R : r(\alpha) \geq 1\}$ (in other words, S is the connected center of the Levi subgroup of G containing A and having R_1 as its root system). These observations will soon be used in the proof of the key lemma needed in the Conjugation Theorem for root valuation lattices.

12. CONJUGATION THEOREM

12.1. Setup for Conjugation Theorem. Again we assume that G is semisimple, and again we fix a root valuation function $r : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. To r are associated subsets $R_n := \{\alpha \in R : r(\alpha) \geq n\}$ and Levi subgroups M_n containing A such that the root system of M_n is R_n . Write L_n for the derived group of M_n and A_n for the connected center of M_n . The corresponding Lie algebras are then related by $\mathfrak{m}_n = \mathfrak{l}_n \oplus \mathfrak{a}_n$.

We will consider some root valuation lattice Λ for r . Recall that Λ has the form

$$\Lambda = \Lambda_A \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in R} P_{\alpha}^{\lambda(\alpha)} \right),$$

where $\Lambda_A = \mathfrak{a}(F)_{\geq r} = \{\sum_i u_i \epsilon^i : u_i \in \mathfrak{a}_{i+1}(\mathbb{C}) \ \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.

As before we consider the normalizer $\mathfrak{k}$ of Λ in $\mathfrak{g}(F)$. Thus $\mathfrak{k} = \{u \in \mathfrak{g}(F) : [u, \Lambda] \subset \Lambda\}$. Again we denote by K the connected admissible proalgebraic subgroup whose Lie algebra is $\mathfrak{k}$.

The goal of this section is to prove the following Conjugation Theorem.

Theorem 12.1. *Let $r' : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be another root valuation function and assume that*

$$|\{\alpha \in R : r'(\alpha) \geq n\}| \leq |R_n|$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Assume further that $u \in \Lambda$ lies in the root valuation stratum $\mathfrak{g}(F)_{r'}$. Then there exists $k \in K$ such that $k^{-1}uk \in \mathfrak{a}(F)_r$. In particular there exists an element w in the Weyl group W such that $r' = wr$.

12.2. Key lemma. The next lemma is the main step in the proof of the Conjugation Theorem. In the lemma we assume that r takes nonnegative values, and therefore from Remark 11.3 we obtain a connected admissible proalgebraic subgroup $\tilde{\Lambda}$ of $G(F)$ having Lie algebra Λ .

Lemma 12.2. *Assume that our given root valuation function takes values in the set of nonnegative integers. Let $u \in \Lambda$ and assume that u is $G(F)$ -conjugate to an element $u'' \in \mathfrak{a}(F)$. Assume further that u'' is regular, so that the root valuation function $r''(\alpha) = \text{val } \alpha(u'')$ is defined. Then the following conclusions hold.*

- (1) $r''(\alpha) \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in R$.
- (2) $|\{\alpha \in R : r''(\alpha) \geq 1\}| \geq |R_1|$.
- (3) *If equality holds in the second item, then there exists $k \in \tilde{\Lambda}$ such that $k^{-1}uk \in \mathfrak{m}_1(F)$.*

Proof. We know from Remark 11.3 that Λ is contained in some parahoric subalgebra, and therefore u and u'' are integral. It follows easily from the fourth part of Lemma 6.1 that $u'' \in \mathfrak{a}(\mathcal{O})$, and the first item of the lemma follows.

We also know from Remark 11.3 that $A_1(\mathbb{C})$ is a maximal torus in $\tilde{\Lambda}$. Therefore there exists $k \in \tilde{\Lambda}$ such that $v := k^{-1}u_s k$ lies in $\mathfrak{a}_1(\mathbb{C})$, u_s being the $\mathbb{C}$ -semisimple part of u (see subsection 10.1). The second item of the lemma then follows from equation (10.1). If equality holds in the second item, then the set of roots in R that vanish on v must be precisely equal to R_1 , the root system of M_1 . Thus the centralizer of v in G must in this case be M_1 . Since $k^{-1}uk$ centralizes v , we conclude that it lies in $\mathfrak{m}_1(F)$, as desired. $\square$

12.3. Proof of the conjugation theorem. Now we prove the conjugation theorem. For each integer n consider the following statement.

$$(S_n) \quad \text{There exists } k \in K \text{ such that } k^{-1}uk \in \mathfrak{m}_n(F).$$

We claim that the statement (S_n) is true for every integer n . This is obvious when $n \ll 0$, so we may use induction on n . We now assume that (S_n) does hold for n and will show that it also holds for $n+1$. It is harmless to replace u by any conjugate under K , so we may as well assume that u itself lies in $\mathfrak{m}_n(F)$. Since u is split regular semisimple in $\mathfrak{g}(F)$, it is also split regular semisimple in $\mathfrak{m}_n(F)$.

Denote by r_n the restriction of r to R_n ; thus r_n is a root valuation function for the semisimple group L_n . Using Proposition 11.1, one checks that r_n and the

integers $\lambda(\alpha)$ ($\alpha \in R_n$) yield a root valuation lattice $\Lambda_n \subset \mathfrak{l}_n(F)$ for (L_n, r_n) , and it is not difficult to see that

$$\Lambda \cap \mathfrak{m}_n(F) = \Lambda_n \oplus (\Lambda_A \cap \mathfrak{a}_n(F)).$$

Since u lies in $\Lambda \cap \mathfrak{m}_n(F)$, it decomposes uniquely as $u = u_{L_n} + u_{A_n}$ with $u_{L_n} \in \Lambda_n$ and $u_{A_n} \in \Lambda_A \cap \mathfrak{a}_n(F)$; clearly u_{L_n} is split regular semisimple in $\mathfrak{l}_n(F)$.

Now $\Lambda'_n := \epsilon^{-n}\Lambda_n$ is a root valuation lattice in $\mathfrak{l}_n(F)$ for the root valuation function $r_n - n$, and since $r_n - n$ takes nonnegative values, we may apply the key lemma to L_n , $r_n - n$ and the element $\epsilon^{-n}u_{L_n}$, it being clear that $\epsilon^{-n}u_{L_n}$ is $L_n(F)$ -conjugate to an element $u'' \in (\mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{l}_n)(F)$ that is regular for L_n (since u_{L_n} is split regular semisimple in $\mathfrak{l}_n(F)$).

Denote by $r'' : R_n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ the root valuation function for u'' . Since u is conjugate under $L_n(F)$ to $u_{A_n} + \epsilon^n u''$ and is also $G(F)$ -conjugate to an element in $\mathfrak{a}(F)_{r'}$, we see that there exists $w \in W$ such that the root valuation function for $u_{A_n} + \epsilon^n u''$ is equal to $w(r')$. For $\alpha \in R_{L_n} = R_n$ we have $\text{val } \alpha(u_{A_n} + \epsilon^n u'') = n + \text{val } \alpha(u'')$, which shows that $r''(\alpha) + n = r'(w^{-1}\alpha)$. It follows that $r'(w^{-1}\alpha) \geq n + 1$ for any $\alpha \in R_n$ such that $r''(\alpha) \geq 1$. Therefore

$$|\{\alpha \in R_n : r''(\alpha) \geq 1\}| \leq |\{\alpha \in R : r'(w^{-1}\alpha) \geq n + 1\}| \leq |R_{n+1}|,$$

showing that equality holds in the second item of the key lemma. By the third item of that lemma we conclude that there exists $k \in \Lambda'_n \subset L_n(F)$ such that $k^{-1}(\epsilon^{-n}u_{L_n})k \in \mathfrak{m}_{n+1}(F)$, and it is then immediate that $k^{-1}uk \in \mathfrak{m}_{n+1}(F)$. Moreover k necessarily lies in K , since it follows easily from Proposition 11.1 that $\Lambda'_n \subset \mathfrak{k}$.

Thus we have shown that the statement (S_n) is true for every integer n . Taking $n \gg 0$, we find that there exists $k \in K$ such that $k^{-1}uk \in \mathfrak{a}(F)$. Since K normalizes Λ , we also have $k^{-1}uk \in \Lambda$, so that $k^{-1}uk$ actually lies in the intersection of Λ and $\mathfrak{a}(F)$, namely $\mathfrak{a}(F)_{\geq r}$. Let $\tilde{r}$ be the root valuation function for $k^{-1}uk$. Then $\tilde{r}(\alpha) \geq r(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in R$. Also by one of the hypotheses in the theorem there exists $w \in W$ such that $r' = w\tilde{r}$, and we then have $r'(\alpha) \geq (wr)(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in R$. By another hypothesis in the theorem we have

$$|\{\alpha \in R : r'(\alpha) \geq n\}| \leq |R_n| = |wR_n| = |\{\alpha \in R : (wr)(\alpha) \geq n\}|.$$

From this, together with the fact that $r'(\alpha) \geq (wr)(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in R$, it follows easily that $r' = wr$, and the proof of the theorem is complete. $\square$

13. EXISTENCE OF BIG ROOT VALUATION LATTICES

We are going to show that there exist root valuation lattices that are big in a suitable sense. For this we need a number of preliminary results.

13.1. Operation $\perp$ on subsets of R . For any subset S of R we put

$$(13.1) \quad S^\perp := \{\beta \in R : \beta \text{ is strongly orthogonal to all roots in } S\}.$$

Lemma 13.1. *Let S, T be subsets of R . Then*

- (1) *If $S \subset T$, then $S^\perp \supset T^\perp$.*
- (2) *$S \subset S^{\perp\perp}$.*
- (3) *$S^{\perp\perp\perp} = S^\perp$.*

Proof. (1) and (2) are obvious, and together they imply (3). $\square$

Lemma 13.2. *Let $\alpha \in R$.*

(1) The centralizer of $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ in $\mathfrak{g}$ is

$$(13.2) \quad \{u \in \mathfrak{a} : \alpha(u) = 0\} \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{\beta \in R : \alpha + \beta \notin R \cup \{0\}} \mathfrak{g}_\beta \right).$$

(2) The centralizer in $\mathfrak{g}$ of the copy of $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ spanned by H_α , $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$ is

$$(13.3) \quad \{u \in \mathfrak{a} : \alpha(u) = 0\} \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{\beta \in \{\alpha\}^\perp} \mathfrak{g}_\beta \right).$$

Proof. Since A normalizes $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$, it normalizes the centralizer of $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$. Therefore this centralizer is the direct sum of its intersections with the summands in the root space decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}$. The decomposition (13.2) then follows from

$$(13.4) \quad [\mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \mathfrak{g}_\beta] = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha+\beta} & \text{if } \alpha + \beta \in R, \\ \mathbb{C}H_\alpha & \text{if } \alpha + \beta = 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This proves (1), of which (2) is an immediate consequence. $\square$

Corollary 13.3. *For any subset S in R the subset $S^\perp$ is $\mathbb{Z}$ -closed.*

Proof. Since intersections of $\mathbb{Z}$ -closed subsets are $\mathbb{Z}$ -closed, it is enough to prove that $S^\perp$ is $\mathbb{Z}$ -closed in the special case $S = \{\alpha\}$, and this is clear from the second part of the previous lemma. $\square$

13.2. Non-archimedean functions $r : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. We say that a function $r : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is *non-archimedean* if for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ the set $R_n = \{\alpha \in R : r(\alpha) \geq n\}$ is $\mathbb{Z}$ -closed. Clearly any root valuation function is non-archimedean. The converse is true when R is of type A_n , but not in general.

It is evident that r is a non-archimedean function if and only if

$$(13.5) \quad r(-\alpha) = r(\alpha)$$

and

$$(13.6) \quad r(\alpha + \beta) \geq \min\{r(\alpha), r(\beta)\} \text{ whenever } \alpha + \beta \in R.$$

Remark 13.4. For any non-archimedean function r , we have equality in (13.6) whenever $r(\alpha) \neq r(\beta)$. Indeed, we may as well assume that $r(\alpha) > r(\beta)$, and then equality in (13.6) can be proved by using (13.6) twice, once for α, β , and once for $\alpha + \beta, -\alpha$ (whose sum is also a root).

Given any function $r : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, we define another function $r_m : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ by

$$(13.7) \quad r_m(\alpha) := \max\{r(\beta) : \beta \text{ is not strongly orthogonal to } \alpha\}.$$

Note that

$$(13.8) \quad r(\alpha) \leq r_m(\alpha)$$

since α is not strongly orthogonal to itself.

Now put $r' = -r_m$. Once again we put $R_n = \{\alpha \in R : r(\alpha) \geq n\}$, and, in the same way, we put $R'_n := \{\alpha \in R : r'(\alpha) \geq n\}$.

Lemma 13.5. *The set R'_n is equal to $(R_{1-n})^\perp$. Moreover r' is a non-archimedean function.*

Proof. To prove the first statement, just unwind the definitions. The second statement follows from the first, together with Corollary 13.3. $\square$

Remark 13.6. It is not always the case that r' is a root valuation function, even when r is itself a root valuation function. This is clear from the lemma we just proved, since there exist $\mathbb{Q}$ -closed subsets S such that $S^\perp$ is not $\mathbb{Q}$ -closed.

Remark 13.7. The notion of root valuation function is more useful than that of non-archimedean function. The notion of non-archimedean function has been introduced only in order to have a convenient way of referring to the properties of r_m that are encoded in the fact that r' is a non-archimedean function.

Later we will make use of the following result.

Lemma 13.8. *Let $r : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be a non-archimedean function. Let α, β, γ be three roots, one of which is equal to the sum of the other two. Then*

- (1) α, β, γ are pairwise non-strongly orthogonal,
- (2) $r(\alpha) + r(\beta) - r(\gamma) \leq \max\{r(\alpha), r(\beta), r(\gamma)\}$,
- (3) $\max\{r(\alpha), r(\beta), r(\gamma)\} \leq \min\{r_m(\alpha), r_m(\beta), r_m(\gamma)\}$,
- (4) $\min\{r_m(\alpha), r_m(\beta), r_m(\gamma)\} \leq r_m(\alpha) + r_m(\beta) - r_m(\gamma)$.

Here r_m is obtained from r as above in (13.7).

Proof. (1) is clear, since each of the three roots is either a sum or difference of the other two, and (3) follows immediately from (1).

Since r is non-archimedean, the triple of integers $r(\alpha), r(\beta), r(\gamma)$ is quite special: either all three are equal, or two of them are equal and the other one is strictly larger. From this (2) follows at once. Finally, (4) follows from (2), applied to the non-archimedean function r' . $\square$

13.3. Some big root valuation lattices. We have seen that in order to get a root valuation lattice $\Lambda_{r,\lambda}$ (for a given root valuation function r), we need a function $k : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying the two conditions

- (1) $k(\alpha) + k(-\alpha) \geq r_m(\alpha) - r(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in R$,
- (2) $k(\alpha) + k(\beta) - k(\alpha + \beta) \geq r(\alpha + \beta) - \min\{r(\alpha), r(\beta)\}$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in R$ such that $\alpha + \beta \in R$.

It is then natural to try to make the quantities on the lefthand sides of the inequalities in (1) and (2) as small as possible. A first thought would be to try to find k for which equality holds in both conditions, but it is easy to see that this is usually impossible.

So we need to try something else. In order to make $\Lambda_{r,\lambda}$ big, we try to enforce equality in (1) without worrying about (2). Define a function k_0 on R as follows:

$$(13.9) \quad k_0(\alpha) := (r_m(\alpha) - r(\alpha))/2.$$

For k_0 it is clear that equality does hold in (1), but of course k_0 takes values in $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, rather than $\mathbb{Z}$, as we would have liked. We fix this by putting

$$(13.10) \quad k_1 := \lceil k_0 \rceil.$$

Lemma 13.9. *Both k_0 and k_1 satisfy conditions (1) and (2). Since k_1 is integer-valued, it then provides us with a root valuation lattice $\Lambda_{r,\lambda}$, where $\lambda = r + k_1$.*

Proof. It is clear that (1) holds for both functions. Next we verify (2). Consider roots α, β such that $\alpha + \beta$ is also a root, call it γ . We must show that

$$(13.11) \quad k(\alpha) + k(\beta) - k(\gamma) \geq r(\gamma) - r(\alpha)$$

for $k = k_0$ and $k = k_1$. We start with k_0 . Using its explicit definition, we see that the inequality we must check is

$$(13.12) \quad r_m(\alpha) + r_m(\beta) - r_m(\gamma) \geq r(\beta) + r(\gamma) - r(\alpha),$$

and this follows from Lemma 13.8, once we note that the hypothesis of that lemma is symmetrical in the three roots, so that the inequalities stated in the conclusion of the lemma remain valid when the three roots are permuted.

This takes care of k_0 . What about k_1 ? Obviously, for any root δ , the integer $k_1(\delta)$ is either $k_0(\delta)$ or $k_0(\delta) + 1/2$, according as $k_0(\delta)$ is integral or half-integral. Therefore, when we pass from k_0 to k_1 , if the lefthand side of (13.11) decreases at all, it can only decrease by $1/2$, and if this is the case, the lefthand side started out by being half-integral, and therefore even after decreasing by $1/2$ it remains bigger than or equal to the righthand side (simply because the righthand side is an integer). Therefore (13.11) also holds for k_1 . $\square$

REFERENCES

- [Art76] J. Arthur, *The characters of discrete series as orbital integrals*, Invent. Math. **32** (1976), 205–261.
- [Bor] A. Borel, *Linear Algebraic Groups*, Benjamin, New York, 1969.
- [BT72] F. Bruhat and J. Tits, *Groupes réductifs sur un corps local. I*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **41** (1972), 5–251.
- [BT84] F. Bruhat and J. Tits, *Groupes réductifs sur un corps local. II*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **60** (1984), 197–376.
- [GKM] M. Goresky, R. Kottwitz and R. MacPherson, *Codimensions of root valuation strata*, PAMQ **5** (2009), 1253–1310.
- [HC66] Harish-Chandra, *Discrete series for semisimple Lie groups II*, Acta Math. **116** (1966), 1–111.
- [Kat79] N. Katz, *Slope filtration of F -crystals*, Astérisque **63** (1979), 113–163.
- [KL88] D. Kazhdan and G. Lusztig, *Fixed point varieties on affine flag manifolds*, Israel J. Math. **62** (1988), 129–168.
- [Kot85] R. Kottwitz, *Isocrystals with additional structure*, Compositio Math. **56** (1985), 201–220.
- [Kot03] R. Kottwitz, *On the Hodge-Newton decomposition for split groups*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **26** (2003), 1433–1447.
- [KR] R. Kottwitz and M. Rapoport, *On the existence of F -crystals*, Comment. Math. Helv., **78** (2003), 153–184.
- [RR96] M. Rapoport and M. Richartz, *On the classification and specialization of F -isocrystals with additional structure*, Compositio Math. **103** (1996), 153–181.
- [Sab] M. Sabitova, *A simplification of root valuation data for classical groups*, 2009 preprint.
- [Vie08] E. Viehmann, *Connected components of closed affine Deligne-Lusztig varieties*, Math. Ann. **340** (2008), 315–333.

KOTTWITZ: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, 5734 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637

VIEHMANN: MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT DER UNIVERSITÄT BONN, ENDENICHER ALLEE 60, 53115 BONN, GERMANY